NIV. OF
ORONTO
IBRARY

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

VOLUME XIII

1918

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
C. F. CLAY, Manager
LONDON : FETTER LANE, E. C. 4

NEW YORK : G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
BOMBAY }
CALCUTTA } MACMILLAN AND CO., Ltd.
MADRAS }
TORONTO : J. M. DENT AND SONS, Ltd.
TOKYO : MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PHilol
M

III

THE
MODERN LANGUAGE
REVIEW

*A QUARTERLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE STUDY
OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN LITERATURE
AND PHILOLOGY*

EDITED BY
J. G. ROBERTSON
G. C. MOORE SMITH
AND
J. FITZMAURICE-KELLY

LIBRARY
TORONTO
UNIVERSITY OF

VOLUME XIII

152030
2/9/19

Cambridge:
at the University Press
1918

PB
1
M65
v.13

CONTENTS

ARTICLES. PAGE

Babington, Percy L., Dryden not the Author of 'MacFlecknoe' . . . 25
Bateson, Hartley, The Text of 'Cleanness' 377
Baugh, A. C., A Seventeenth Century Play-list 401
Bayfield, M. A., Our Traditional Prosody and an Alternative . . 157
Bell, Aubrey F. G., Gil Vicente's 'Auto da Alma'. 58
Charlton, H. B., The Date of 'Love's Labour's Lost' . . . 257, 387
Esposito, M., Anglo-Norman Poems in a Dublin Manuscript . . 312
Ferguson, A. S., The Plays of George Chapman 1
Gosse, Edmund, A Visit to the Friends of Ibsen 282
Hughes, Merritt Y., Spenser's 'Blatant Beast' 267
Kastner, L. E., Antoine de la Sale and the Doubtful Works . 35, 183
Ker, W. P., De Superbia Carminum 292
Priebsch, R., Walther von der Vogelweide: 'Abschied von der Welt' (Lachmann, 100, 24; Paul, 91) 465
Purves, John, A Hitherto Unidentified Source of Huyghens' Satire ''T Kostelick Mal' 78
Rennert, Hugo A., Lope de Vega's Comedias 'Los Pleitos de Ingalaterra' and 'La Corona de Hungría' 455
Seth-Smith, Beatrice C., Mallet's 'Histoire de Dannemarc' as a Source of 'Han d'Islande' 297
Smith, W. F., Rabelais' Lists of Fowls, Fishes, Serpents and Wild Beasts 431
Thorn-Drury, G., Dryden's 'MacFlecknoe.' A Vindication . . 276
Tilley, Arthur, Grimarest's 'Life of Molière' 439
Toynbee, Paget, Dante and the 'Cursus': A New Argument in favour of the Authenticity of the 'Quaestio de Aqua et Terra' . . . 420
Toynbee, Paget, The Laurentian Text (*Cod. Laurent.* xxix, 8) of Dante's Letter to the Italian Cardinals (*Epist.* VIII) 208
Wilson, J. Dover, The Parallel Plots in 'Hamlet': A Reply to Dr W. W. Greg 129
Wright, Herbert, Lapp Songs in English Literature 412

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES. PAGE

Blondheim, D. S., Notes on the Sources of Anatole France . . . 333
Bradley, Henry, 'Mealy-mouthed' 94
Daunt, Marjorie, Some Difficulties of 'The Seafarer' reconsidered . 474

Fowler, J. T., Verses on 'The Bee' . . . 319
Fox, Cecilia M., Recovery of a Lost Leaf in Harleian MS. 2382 . . . 328
Gillet, J. E., A Note on the Tragic 'Admiratio' . . . 233
Macmillan, Michael, 'Wunder Ane' in Layamon's 'Brut' . . . 480
MacSweeney, Joseph J., 'Lord Randal' . . . 325
Mead, D. M., The Authorship of 'The Cures of the Diseased' . . . 480
Onions, C. T., A Devotion of the Cross written in the South West of England . . . 228
Pope, M. K., The Dialect of 'Gormont and Isembart' . . . 335
Priebsch, R., Walther von der Vogelweide, 67, 32 (Lachmann) . . . 230
Robertson, J. G., Lessing, Maffei and Calepio . . . 482
Rudler, Gustave, Un Billet de Paul-Louis Courier . . . 98
Rudler, Gustave, La Source de la Scène des Portraits dans 'Hernani' 329
Scott, Alice A., Grillparzer's 'Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen' and Houwald's 'Der Leuchtturm' . . . 487
Simpson, Percy, Horatio and the Ghost in 'Hamlet' . . . 321
Strong, H. A., Notes on the Vocabulary of the Grammarian, Virgilius Maro . . . 96
Tilley, M. P., Shakespeare's 'Love's Labour's Lost,' Act iv, sc. i, 105 . 85
Weekley, Ernest, Etymology of 'Rile' . . . 328
Weekley, Ernest, 'Mealy-mouthed' . . . 327
Wells, John Edwin, Fielding's 'Miscellanies' . . . 481
Wilson, F. P., 'A Wonderful Prognostication' (1591) . . . 84
Wright, Herbert, Ben Jonson on Elizabethan Translations of Homer and Virgil . . . 322
Wright, Herbert, Matthew Arnold's 'East and West' . . . 324
Wright, Herbert, The Sources of Carlyle's Lecture on 'The Hero as Divinity' . . . 87
Wright, Herbert, The Source of Matthew Arnold's 'Forsaken Merman' 90
Wyatt, Alfred J., Notes on Anglo-Saxon Charters, etc. . . . 83
Young, Sir George, The Shift in the Value of English Vowels . . 319

REVIEWS.

Alfero, G. A., Novalis e il suo Heinrich von Ofterdingen (J. G. Robertson) . . . 358
Barstow, M. L., Wordsworth's Theory of Poetic Diction (G. L. Bickersteth) . . . 351
Bastier, P., La Nouvelle individualiste en Allemagne (John Lees) . 372
Brown, Carleton, Register of Middle English Religious Verse (J. A. Herbert) . . . 489
Burd, H. A., Joseph Ritson (W. P. Ker) . . . 496
Carnahan, D. H., The Ad Deum Vadit of Jean Gerson (Jessie Crosland) 503
Colvin, Sidney, Life of John Keats (A. A. Jack) . . . 353
Common Conditions, ed. by Tucker Brooke (Walter Worrall) . . . 242
Coulton, G. G., Social Life in Britain from the Conquest to the Reformation (A. Hamilton Thompson) . . . 339
Courtney, W. P., Bibliography of Johnson (Paget Toynbee) . . . 345
Croce, B., Gli Scritti di F. de Santis (Edmund G. Gardner) . . . 510

REVIEWS *cont.* PAGE

Dante Alighieri, De Monarchia e De Vulgari Eloquentia (Paget Toynbee) . . . 365
Dicey, A. V., The Statesmanship of Wordsworth (C. W. Previté-Orton) 108
Farinelli, A., La Vita è un Sogno (J. G. Robertson) . . . 358
Fisher, L. A., The Mystic Vision in the Grail Legend and in the Divine Comedy (E. G. Gardner) . . . 508
Fletcher, J. B., Dante (Edmund G. Gardner) . . . 508
Forsyth, R. S., A Study of the Plays of Thomas d'Urfey (Montague Summers) . . . 103
Gabetti, G., Il Dramma di Zacharias Werner (J. G. Robertson) . . . 358
Grandgent, C. H., The Ladies of Dante's Lyrics (Edmund G. Gardner) 508
Hauch, E. F., Gottfried Keller as a Democratic Idealist (John Lees) . 121
Haughton, W., An Englishman for my Money, ed. by A. C. Baugh (W. W. Greg) . . . 100
Hawkins, R. L., Maistre Charles Fontaine, Parisien (A. Tilley) . . 363
Held, F. E., Christianopolis by J. V. Andreæ (G. C. Moore Smith) . 368
Iacob and Iosep, ed. by A. S. Napier (Anna C. Paues) . . . 239
Jarintzow, N., Russian Poets and Poems (W. J. Sedgefield) . . . 254
Kittredge, G. L., Chaucer's Lollius (G. G. Coulton) . . . 240
Kohler, P., Madame de Staël et la Suisse (J. G. Robertson) . . . 504
Långfors, A., Notice du Manuscrit Français 12483 de la Bibl. Nat. (Jessie Crosland) . . . 111
Lentino, the Poetry of Giacomo da, ed. by E. F. Langley (W. P. Ker) . 250
Lope de Vega, Obras, ed. by D. Emilio Cotarelo y Mori, I (H. A. Rennert) . . . 113
Kretzmann, P. E., The Liturgical Element in the Earliest Forms of the Medieval Drama (B. W. Downs) . . . 491
Meillet, A., Caractères généraux des Langues germaniques (E. Classen) 120
Mitchell, R. M., Heyse and his Predecessors in the Theory of the Novelle (John Lees) . . . 372
Moore, E., Studies in Dante, IV (J. Collison-Morley) . . . 506
Mystère d'Adam, Le, ed. by P. Studer (Jessie Crosland) . . . 501
Northup, C. S., A Bibliography of Thomas Gray (Paget Toynbee) . . 343
Palmer, H. E., Colloquial English, I (Anna C. Paues) . . . 500
Polish Authors, More Tales by, Transl. by C. M. Benecke and M. Busch (A. Bruce-Boswell) . . . 123
Pombo, Rafael, Poesias ; Traducciones poéticas ; Fabulas y Verdades (B. Sanín Caro) . . . 252
Rippmann, W., The Sounds of Spoken English (Anna C. Paues) . . 499
Robertson, J. M., Shakespeare and Chapman (H. Dugdale Sykes) . 244
Royal Society of Literature, Transactions of the, XXXV (G. L. Bickersteth) . . . 497
Scarborough, D., The Supernatural in Modern English Fiction (Montague Summers) . . . 346
Slataper, Scipio, Ibsen (J. G. Robertson) . . . 358
Williams, S. T., Richard Cumberland (Montague Summers) . . . 492
Zachrisson, R. E., Pronunciation of English Vowels, 1400—1700 (Allen Mawer) . . . 109

MINOR NOTICES. PAGE

Buck, G., The Social Criticism of Literature 124
Fialho de Almeida, J. V. 127
Forbes, N., Third Russian Book 128
Freese, J. H., Russian Dictionary 128
Gabrielson, A., The Earliest Swedish Works on English Pronunciation before 1750 512
Haller, W., The Early Life of Robert Southey, 1774–1803 . . . 512
Hazlitt, Characters of Shakespeare's Plays 125
Kittredge, G. L., Shakspere 123
Minot, Laurence, The War Ballads of, ed. by D. C. Stedman . . 511
Neilson, W. A., Burns, How to know him 256
Ord, H., London shown by Shakspeare 126
Russian Lyrics, ed. by J. D. Duff 128
Shaksperian Studies, ed. by Brander Matthews 126
Sherman, S. P., Matthew Arnold, How to know him 256
Tolstoi, L., Sevastopol, ed. by A. P. Goudy and E. Bullough . . . 128
Zachrisson, R. E., Notes on Early English Personal Names . . 510

VOLUME XIII JANUARY, 1918 NUMBER 1

THE PLAYS OF GEORGE CHAPMAN.

THE following notes attempt to throw light on some vexed passages in Chapman's plays. 'Where the thread of his meaning,' says Professor Boas, 'seems to disappear amidst his fertile imagery—one feels not that sense is lacking, but that one has failed to find the clue to the zigzag movements of Chapman's brain.' This clue often lies in his learned allusiveness. His mind was saturated with Stoic doctrine, and the language of his characters is drawn freely from that tradition. But his references are often indirect because he was so much at home in that older world. He may merely imply distinctions familiar to him though obscure to his audience, or, with an inborn love of paradox, he allows his characters to distort the original argument for their immediate purpose, or sometimes he mistakes or mistranslates his source. Although I give sources when I happen to meet them, that is not the primary purpose of this paper. Many of his references seem to be to the general doctrine rather than to particular passages. I think that it can be shown, in some cases at least, that he had no book open before him, but linked images and allusions together through some association aroused by the immediate situation.

This sensitiveness to images has called forth the harshest criticism. Chapman is accused of heaping up metaphors to no definite purpose. Now such passages are generally at salient points in the dramas, like Bussy's first speech or his last, and it would be a serious indictment of Chapman's literary skill if they had no internal coherence or appropriateness. As I hope to show, he is obscure at these times for two reasons. When he approaches a climax, his speech becomes concentrated, and thus doubly difficult for those who do not move in his atmosphere; also he uses metaphors to establish successive points in the argument. Though the images may be disparate, yet they are held together by an underlying thought which is developed by means of them, and the whole passage is thus fused into a unity. It is fair, no doubt, to argue that such a poet will not always hold or please his audience, but I believe that Mr Boas is right in suggesting that the thread is there if we can lay hands on it. Chapman looked on life through books more than most Elizabethans, and to books we must go if we would understand whence his men of action as well as his scholars drew their circle of ideas.

‘BUSSY D’AMBOIS[1]’.

I, i. The first speech of Bussy ‘illustrates,’ according to Mr Boas, ‘the difficult compression of Chapman’s style and the diversion of his thought from strictly logical sequence by his excessive use of simile.’ It is, however, the case that the similes have a logical sequence, and I propose to analyse the speech to show how Chapman is wont to use them.

Enter Bussy D’Ambois poore.

Fortune, not Reason, rules the state of things,
Reward goes backwards, Honour on his head,
Who is not poore is monstrous; only Need
Gives forme and worth to every humane seed.

The text of this soliloquy had already been used to head Plutarch’s *De Fortuna*: it is a tragic verse—*τύχη τὰ θνητῶν πράγματ’, οὐκ εὐβουλία*.... So this is not a plaint against the universe, but the poor man’s criticism of courts and honours, since ‘Reason’ is the translation of *εὐβουλία*[2]. Real worth goes with poverty. This comes from Chapman’s source too: *πότερον...ἐκ τύχης μὲν καὶ διὰ τύχην* Ἀριστείδης *ἐνεκαρτέρησε τῇ πενίᾳ, πολλῶν χρημάτων κύριος γενέσθαι δυνάμενος*—and Plutarch adds a list of just statesmen who despised wealth. The opening lines strike the contrast, so familiar in Chapman, between inner worth and external show[3], and the succeeding similes carry it out. The words ‘monstrous’ and ‘seed’ possibly anticipate the two following metaphors;

As cedars beaten with continuall stormes,
So great men flourish; and doe imitate
Unskilfull statuaries, who suppose
(In forming a Colossus) if they make him
Stroddle enough, stroot, and look bigg, and gape,

---

[1] I take Boas’s text in this play and in the *Revenge*. Other references are to Parrott’s edition. In *Bussy* I owe a special debt to Prof. Boas’s discovery that Chapman had used the Senecan *Hercules Oetaeus* (see on III, ii).

[2] Bussy is already the Stoic hero (see note on III, ii). The Latin is *sapientia*. It is, I think, certain from a quotation in the answer to critics prefaced to the *Masque of the Middle Temple* that Chapman used the first edition of Xylander’s parallel text. The circumstances in which these notes were written must be my excuse for quoting Plutarch indifferently in Greek or in Latin.

[3] *Revenge*, I, i, 153, 295, 310, 343; II, i, 192. *Byron’s Conspiracy*, III, ii, 229; IV, i, 179. *Byron’s Tragedy*, IV, ii, 309.

Their work is goodly: so men meerely great
In their affected gravity of voice,
Sowrnesse of countenance, manners cruelty,
Authority, wealth, and all the spawne of Fortune,
Think they beare all the Kingdomes worth before them;
Yet differ not from those colossick statues,
Which, with heroique formes without o'respread,
Within are nought but morter, flint and lead.

These similes give the measure of the man puffed with Reward and Honour[1]. Professor Boas criticizes Chapman for 'his singular canon of aesthetics that estimates the worth of a statue by the materials out of which it is made,' and also for likening 'great men' first to sculptors and then to statues. But an aesthetic canon is not primarily at stake; the statuaries are unskilful because they are bad engineers. Our clue is stability; good men stand through inner worth, while the 'additions' of courtiers offer a large surface to 'the frantick puffes of blind borne chance[2].' The whole figure is closely translated from Plutarch's *Ad Principem Ineruditum*, where the moral which our poet omits is added for the benefit of the prince. 'Sic enim et ipsi [principes] vocis gravitate, et vultus torvitate, morumque importunitate, et aversatione convictus, videntur maiestatem imperii prae se ferre, nihil omnino differentes a colossicis istis statuis quae foris heroica aut divina ornatae forma, intus terra, lapidibus, et plumbo sunt repleti. Hoc interest, quod statuarum istarum *moles rectitudinem servat* perpetuam absque inclinatione. ineruditi autem principes *ab interna sua inscitia* saepenumero labefactantur atque subvertuntur. basi enim non sitae ad lineam et angulos rectos potestatem superstruentes excelsam, una vergunt, etc.[3].' The second point criticized, the confusion of sculptor and statue, is also taken over from Plutarch, and seems to be justifiable because men are at once the architects and material of their own fortune. These two similes together then suggest the peril that overweening grandeur incurs from within and without[4].

Professor Boas writes, 'in l. 18 a new thought is started, that of the transitoriness of life, and the perishable nature of its gifts, and as the ocean voyager needs a stay-at-home pilot to steer him safely into port, so the adventurer in the "waves of glassie glory" (ll. 29—30) is bidden look to "vertue" for guidance to his desired haven—not exactly the conclusion to be expected from the opening lines of the speech.' Now the whole comparison requires this new thought if it is to be complete. The poet applies the result of his similes. Our colossic statist goes down before the wind, and every man has a tenure as fragile, whatever his place or possessions.

---

[1] The first quarto reads in v. 10, *our tympanouse statists*, a more expressive phrase, though not quite consistent with v. 17.

[2] v, ii, 44. Cf. 'Some doctrine of stabilitie and freedome | Contempt of outward greatnesse, and the guises | That vulgar great ones make their pride and zeale'...*Revenge*, I, i, 154. Cf. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, 34, 18, for devices to ensure the stability of colossi.

[3] It will be seen that Chapman, in leaving out the application, has made the significance of 'morter, flint and lead' ambiguous. The fillings are poor stuff compared with the outward form, but they *are* ballast. This becomes apparent from Plutarch. The phrase really answers to the 'poore staid fisher-man' below (v. 26).

[4] When Bussy is about to fall, the metaphor of the trees is used of him too (v, ii, 37), but is inverted.

> Man is a torch borne in the winde[1]; a dreame
> But of a shadow, *summ'd with all his substance.*

The *substance* is external, and this thought is developed in the fine simile that follows:

> And as great seamen using all their wealth 20
> And skills in Neptunes deepe invisible pathes,
> In tall ships richly built and ribd with brasse,
> To put a girdle round about the world,
> When they have done it (comming neere their haven)
> Are faine to give a warning peece, and call 25
> *A poore staid fisher-man*, that never past
> His countries sight, to waft and guide them in.

The condition of safety for the rich solid ship is the poor fisherman, for the most ambitious statist, 'vertue.' Now this is the fourth term without which the whole group of similes drops. What makes for stability?—the great colossus needs ballast; the seaman in his strong ship requires a pilot; the statesman, because of his very height, needs 'vertue.' We have seen that the omission of Plutarch's application leaves the meaning of 'morter, flint and lead' ambiguous, but here the figure is made precise by a further simile. He has now worked out the contrast between Fortune and worth made in the opening lines. There too lay an ambiguity, as 'Need' might be taken in precise opposition to 'Fortune[2].' That difficulty also was resolved by Chapman's source. One could not have a better instance of his elliptical mode of reference. The whole speech develops the contrast set in v. 4, and forms a dramatic prologue to the temptation which Monsieur is immediately to offer. We cannot measure its full significance till we have seen Bussy rise and fall, to cry with his last words 'Oh fraile condition of strength, valour, vertue | In me.' But we are not left with that as the final impression, for the Friar's shade promises him the reward of a 'compleat man[1].'

---

[1] Perhaps the metaphor of wind is carried on from the previous similes. It might be noted that Pindar's 'dream of a shadow' occurs in a like movement of thought. 'In a little moment groweth up the delight of men; yea, and in like sort falleth it to the ground, when a doom adverse hath shaken it. Things of a day, what are we, and what not? Man is a dream of shadows. Nevertheless when a glory from God hath shined on them, a clear light abideth' (*Pythian Odes*, 8, 92, tr. Myers).

[2] The point is, not that the world is governed by Fortune, but that courts are, and men so raised are likely to fall. Compare especially v. 128 ff. below: 'If I may bring up a new fashion, | And rise in Court for vertue......'

v. 34. *Mons.* There is no second place in numerous state
That holds more than a cypher; in a King
All places are contain'd.

That is, the king is the unit giving significance to the row of noughts that follow. 'Numerous' has given difficulty. Chapman knew well Aristotle's distinction between the general point of view of the statesman and the particular insight or wisdom of the private man[2]. To illustrate the distinction Aristotle quotes a fragment of Euripides: 'prudentem enim quis me putet mortalium, | cui suppetebat absque ullo negotio | in totius turba *numerato* exercitus | sortem parem obtinere sapientissimo? | praestantiores namque et eos qui pluribus | se rebus implicant, male odit Iuppiter[3].' Considering how often Chapman recurs to the distinction of Aristotle, is it hazardous to conjecture that 'numerous' is a reminiscence of *numerato* (= *ἠριθμημένον*)? There is a clear example of his mode of allusion immediately afterwards, linked, it may be, by the mention of Jove and men in high place:

His words and looks
Are like the flashes and the bolts of Jove;
His deeds inimitable.

Why *inimitable*? Because the 'bolts of Jove' reminded him of another king in Vergil (*Aen.*, VI, 590), Salmoneus, who feigned to wield the *non imitabile fulmen* of Jupiter; so the adjective was appropriately transferred to the next noun[4].

v. 122. Like to disparking noble husbandmen,
Hee'll put his plow into me, plow me up;
But his unsweating thrift is policie,
And learning-hating policie is ignorant
To fit his seed-land soyl.

A reminiscence of *Hercules Oetaeus*, 632 (see note on III, ii): 'Colit hic reges regumque lares, | non ut presso vomere semper | nunquam cesset curvus arator | vel mille secent arva coloni; | solas optat quas ponat opes. | Colit hic reges, calcet ut omnes | perdatque aliquos nullumque

---

[1] See notes on V, iv.

[2] See notes on III, i, 63; *Revenge*, II, i, 31.

[3] I give the version of Lambinus (*Ethics*, VI, 9), which contains the reference to Jupiter's jealousy of the great, while the original does not. This is significant, because it may well have suggested the clear reference to Salmoneus' aspiration which follows.

[4] Cf. *Revenge*, III, iii, 254: 'things uncredited,' a reminiscence of 'non unquam credita Teucris,' *Aeneid*, II, 246.

levet: | tantum ut noceat cupit esse potens.' The rather obscure metaphor represents a quite straightforward original and is given a contemporary reference. The Senecan chorus (like Bussy's prologue) is directed against courtiers. If we add the possible reference to Aristotle and the certain reminiscence of Salmoneus, it would seem as though Chapman's memory, if not his commonplace-book, had a section devoted to pride and ambition.

I, ii, 175–183. Cf. *Hercules Oetaeus*, 710–3.

II, i, 50. ...but in their browes
Pyrrho's opinion in great letters shone:
That life and death in all respects are one.

Stobaeus, *Florilegium*, 121. 28: Πύρρων ἔλεγε μηδὲν διαφέρειν ζῆν ἢ τεθνάναι. Compare the Alexandrian epigram: '"Are you dead, Pyrrho?" "I do not know."' For a similar story told of Thales, see Bacon, *Apophthegms* (Spedding, VII, p. 156).

II, i, 141. If ever Nature held her selfe her owne,
When the great triall of a King and subject
Met in one bloud, both from one belly springing,
Now prove her vertue and her greatnesse one,
Or make the t'one the greater with the t'other, 145
(As true Kings should) and for your brothers love
(Which is a speciall species of true vertue)
Doe that you could not doe, not being a King.

Professor Parrott takes *Nature* as the tie of blood, *vertue* as 'the power,' the effective quality of the tie of blood, and *greatnesse* as 'its closeness.' This interpretation leaves no *triall* for the king to reconcile, although the last lines certainly are a strained attempt to unite *vertue* and *greatnesse*. Also an opposition is assumed between *vertue* and the king's natural scruples, so that *greatnesse* is dropped, although v. 145 manifestly refers to it. The point, it seems, lies in the king's double relation to Monsieur, as king to subject and as mere brother (vv. 142, 143). According to Aristotle[1] there are two kinds of friendship, that between equals, and that between unequals. Brotherly friendship is *par excellence* one of equality or comradeship (a 'speciall species,' cf. *Ethics*, VIII, 12, §§ 4 and 6); while that of king and subject is the extreme case of the friendship of inequality (φιλία καθ' ὑπεροχήν, *Eth.*, VIII, 7). These two relationships then are the extremes in the scale of friendship, and both affect the king's attitude to Monsieur. Now when one friend is *greater*, he does not owe so much to the other as the other to him; so the king, as king, need not owe Bussy's life to Monsieur. But a

---

[1] The next sixty lines of Chapman are based on Aristotelian conceptions.

true king, as opposed to a tyrant, does confer transcendent benefits on his friends (*Eth.*, VIII, 11, §§ 1 and 6)[1]. The proper basis of all friendship, equal or unequal, is virtue, and on that foundation persons who are unequal can be most truly friends (VIII, 8, § 5). This supplies the transition to the greater demand which Monsieur, as brother, can make. If the king spares Bussy, he will make his superiority greater by conferring a transcendent benefit, and he will use his royal power to do a (virtuous) act of equal friendship for his brother, which the latter, as subject, could hardly demand. Thus *greatnesse* and *vertue* become reconciled in this act of friendship—the act is *good* and the king has *power* to confer the benefit. It may be remarked that Chapman's manner is to insert references to his philosophical sources in brackets, and both the clauses in parenthesis seem to be reminiscences of the *Ethics.* The oppositions of the double relationship and of *greatnesse* to *vertue* seem to guarantee this interpretation. They give the kind of proportion which fascinated Chapman's mind. It will be found that the Aristotelian doctrine of proportion is also the basis of the arguments following this passage. The 'spice of justice' (v. 152) is of course equity. See note on III, i, 62.

II, ii, 181 (=Parrott, v. 131) I will in;
And cast my selfe off, as I ne're had beene.

Dr H. Bradley (in Parrott's notes) suggests that this means 'renounce my former self.' P. doubtfully accepts this in the sense that she 'renounces her intention of meeting Bussy.' But the context seems to show that she gives up her *former*, i.e. chaste, self. The question is 'how shall I live | And not consume in blushes?' and this is her answer. How else interpret 'as I ne're had beene'? Compare v. 171 (= P. 121) and v. 45 (printed in Parrott's apparatus): 'I must utter that | That will in parting breake more strings in me, | Than death when life parts.' This is the turning point for Tamyra.

III, i, 20. *Bussy.* Sin is a coward, madam, and insults
But on our weaknesse, in his truest valour:
And so our ignorance tames us, that we let
His shadowes fright us: and like empty clouds
In which our faulty apprehensions forge
The formes of dragons, lions, elephants,
When they hold no proportion, the slie charmes
Of the witch policy makes him like a monster
Kept onely to shew men for servile money:
That false hagge often paints him in her cloth
Ten times more monstrous than he is in troth.

---

[1] Cf. *Chabot*, II, iii, 89–93 and vv. 164–5, 174.

'A characteristic illustration of how one simile in Chapman's verse begets another, with little regard for logical sequence. The "shadowes" with which sin frightens us are first compared to the imaginary creatures into which fancy shapes the clouds; then sin itself (relegated from an active to a passive part) is likened not to a pure creation of the fancy, but to an exaggerated picture of a real monster displayed by "policy," i.e. the craft which seeks to debar men from their desires' (Boas).

This is a good instance of Chapman's dialectic. Bussy is not speaking of sin in general terms; he is persuading Tamyra, who is still reluctant. She has said (1) that she is 'subject to the heartlesse feare | Of every shadow' (vv. 7—8); (2) that Sin lays a 'dangerous siege' about us—'O,...the tyrannie | He exercises when he hath expugn'd!' (vv. 11—13); (3) that Sin is 'like to the horror of a winter's thunder, | Mixt with a gushing storme,' etc. (14—19). It is Bussy's business to convert these similes to his purpose, and that is what his speech accomplishes. (1) Sin is a coward presuming on our weakness. This answers the metaphor of the siege. (2) If Tamyra is afraid of shadows, that *is* her weakness, but they are really no more than shadows. This answers vv. 7—8. (3) Then he catches up the simile of the storm, and makes the transition from the shadows to the harmless appearances that 'empty' clouds are seen to take. Now the common note of all these comparisons is that they take up Tamyra's similes and reduce them to nothing. Sin has but a frightening *appearance.* As for the last two lines, surely the point is again that people do not penetrate behind the cloth, but, like Tamyra, take the painted image at its face value. The unequal 'proportion' is—empty clouds : the forms of dragons, etc. :: real monster : painted monster : : Sin as it is : Sin's shadows! By *nature* sin is nothing; by *convention* it is terrible—that is the underlying thought.

III, i, 62. It is not I, but urgent destiny
That (as great states-men for their generall end
In politique justice make poore men offend)
Enforceth my offence to make it just.
What shall weak dames doe, when th' whole work of Nature
Hath a strong finger in each one of us?
Needs must that sweep away the silly cobweb
Of our still-undone labours, that layes still
Our powers to it, as to the line, the stone,
Not to the stone, the line should be oppos'd.

The clue to this passage is Aristotle, *Ethics*, v, 10 (Lambinus, c. 14). Tamyra curiously perverts Aristotle to justify her own frailty. The chapter in question discusses the relation of equity to law and justice.

Justice by its nature is general and cannot fit the particular case, while equity is a rectification of this in view of the particular. There thus arises a defect (*culpa*) from the nature of legal justice, a defect which 'lies not in the law nor in the lawgiver, but in the nature of the case.' Now Tamyra applies the apparent dilemma arising out of this—'either what is just is not good, or what is equitable is not just'—to her own case in vv. 63–4, 'politique justice' being *iustitia* etc. While Aristotle solves the dilemma, it is her interest to accept it. She does so plausibly by supposing that the *culpa* or defect of justice is a positive offence (the Latin is *peccatur*) forced on the individual, the force being applied by the statesman for his end. This distortion of 'politique justice,' again, is rendered natural because the 'policy' known to the age was that inculcated by Machiavelli[1]. The Latin version of Aristotle shows how easily Chapman could pervert the sense: 'non enim culpa legis est, neque eius qui legem tulit, *sed naturae rerum.*' There is no general reference to Nature here, but simply to the nature of the case. There is also probably a confusion between the source of her passions and that providential Nature which plans all to its end. Thus destiny or Nature 'enforceth my offence to make it just' by its necessary general law. Then, by a last curious turn (vv. 69—71), the Aristotelian simile illustrating the relation of justice and equity is made to emphasize the compulsion exercised by Nature ('th' whole work of Nature......layes still | Our powers to it, as to the line, the stone, | Not to the stone, the line should be oppos'd'). Now Aristotle said that what is indeterminate like equity can have as its measure only something in itself indeterminate, like that leaden rule[2] of Lesbian architecture which could be adjusted to the idiosyncrasies of any curved surface: 'nam ad lapidis figuram torquetur et inflectitur, neque regula eadem manet.' According to Aristotle the measure was adaptable, but Tamyra makes Nature's plumb-line allow of no such adaptation. (For another reference to the 'line of justice' cf. *Byron's Conspiracy*, IV, i, 187.) Needless to say, most of this cobweb of ingenuities is a conscious effort of Chapman's. A similar perversion of Aristotle occurs in the *Revenge* (see *R. B.*, II, i, 30–56) side by side with the truer doctrine (v. 115). Cf. also *Chabot*, I, i, 181, and *Caesar and Pompey*, I, ii, 117, the former a perversion, the latter true Aristotelian.

v. 69, 'Still-undone labours,' a reference to the unequal strife of housewife and spider.

---

[1] So constantly in Chapman, e.g. I, i, 124.

[2] The Latin *regula plumbea* may have suggested the plumb-line.

III, ii. Professor Boas was the first to point out an adaptation of the *Hercules Oetaeus* in Bussy's death-scene[1], and as he and Professor Parrott recognize, Bussy was 'to the dramatist the classical Hercules born anew, accomplishing similar feats, and lured to a similar treacherous doom[2].'

In this scene Bussy, the Stoic model of action, is set on by the king to cleanse the court as Hercules cleansed the earth for Jove (v. 4). The metaphor of the king's eagle hawking, used throughout, is doubtless a reminiscence of *Iliad*, 8. 210 (Chapman's translation)[3]. Bussy's second speech reveals him as the champion of justice. He threatens to make certain extortioners and misusers of public money disgorge. The first is a great man, enriched with public funds,

> That affects royaltie, rising from a clapdish;
> That rules so much more than his suffering King,
> That he makes kings of his subordinate slaves:
> Himselfe and them graduate like woodmongers
> Piling a stack of billets from the earth,
> Raising each other into steeples heights;
> Let him convey this on the turning props
> Of Protean law, and (his owne counsell keeping)
> Keepe all upright—let me but hawlk at him,
> Ile play the vulture, and so thump his liver
> That (like a huge unlading Argosea)
> He shall confesse all, and you then may hang him.

By this simile of the woodmongers, a mean occupation used to illustrate a soaring ambition, Chapman designs slightingly to describe the ambition of the great man and his followers. As the king is expressly called Jove, one might expect here the familiar metaphor of the giants[4] heaping mountains to reach heaven, while Bussy as Hercules overcomes them. I feel that the *form* of that heroic assault may have suggested the form of this simile: those heaped mountains; these would-be great men pile—billets. Such a mode of expressing contempt is not unlike Chapman, and below is subjoined another reason why the giants may be in his mind. At all events the metaphor expresses ambition and the gradation of the aspirants one above the other.

The second part is more difficult. 'His own counsell keeping' can hardly mean keeping a private lawyer for extortion (Parrott), for the phrase has far too well defined a sense in itself to bear such an interpretation without the strongest evidence, and the context excludes it here. The point is not extortion through the forms of law, but the relentless tracking down of the extortioner despite his use of every shift of law. This is clear from *Protean*, no worn-out metaphor; to Chapman it recalls the transformations of Proteus when Menelaus held him fast and made him give up his secret[1]. Even so Bussy will hold fast till his quarry 'confesse all.' I suspect that Chapman is thinking primarily of the spoil to be disgorged (hence the metaphor of the Argosy). If so, 'this' (v. 34), which must be the 'stack of billets' (v. 32), stands for the 'publique riches' of v. 27. Mysterious as the 'turning props' sound, I am not certain that they mean more than the wheels upon which the spoil is conveyed away. But perhaps someone with more knowledge of woodmongers may be able to suggest a better meaning. In any case the sense is: 'let the great man carry off his plunder as secretly as he can, using every device of law to keep all stable, yet I will make him confess all.' It should be noted that 'convey' (with its implication of secrecy), like 'his own counsell keeping,' is in direct antithesis to 'He shall confesse all.'

---

[1] v, iv, 100–108; and see his note on v. 149 (p. 163).
[2] Boas, *Bussy*, xxx, cf. Parrott, *Tragedies*, p. 546.
[3] For the comparison of justice to a bird [the eagle] cf. *Chabot*, II, iii, 225; III, i, 228.
[4] 'Giantism against heaven,' cf. v. 144 below and *Chabot*, III, ii, 97; also *C. and P.*, v, i, 191.

The torture by the vulture is generally held to be a reference to Prometheus, and probably with justice, since the extraction of a carefully guarded secret is the point. But the metaphor was suggested, I think, by the torture of Tityus. I had felt that a passage in the *Aeneid* (VI, 580 ff.) was haunting Chapman when he wrote this speech. There Vergil describes the fate of the aspiring giants and of Salmoneus[2], who feigned to be Jove, and of Tityus gnawed by the vulture. Our present text of Vergil reads *immortale iecur tondens* (v. 598). But as my colleague Professor A. E. Codd points out, some older editors read *tundens*, which may explain why Chapman used the curious '*thump* his liver.' There is at least a fair presumption that Chapman's text of Vergil read *tundens*[3]. If so, it is easier to suppose that the mention of the giants suggested the piling of the billets 'from earth'[4].

---

[1] Cf. *Byron's Conspiracy*, V, i, 148: 'Took Amiens in these arms, and held her fast | In spite of all the pitchy fires she cast | And clouds of bullets pour'd upon my breast | Till she show'd yours, and took her natural form.' Here the reference is probably to the tale of Peleus and Thetis.

[2] For a clear reminiscence of this passage, cf. note on I, i, 38.

[3] *Tundo, I thump*, is also the word for a smith hammering, and the influence of Chapman's text of Vergil may perhaps be detected in an addition to the Homeric description of Tityus, *Odyssey*, XI, 786 (tr.):

> 'And each [vulture] by turns the concrete entrails breaks
> (*As smiths their steel beat*) set on either side.'

[4] At present I have not access to Renaissance texts of Vergil. The interpretation of this passage owes much to the valuable criticisms and suggestions of Mr Codd, though I would not venture to commit him to complete agreement with me.

The more Chapman is studied, the more one feels the ghosts of the past rising behind his language[1].

The king's praise of Bussy in vv. 88—110 is based on the Stoic notion of a golden age when wise and heroic men, their models, ruled the earth, so that the present kingly or tyrannical power was unnecessary. Seneca, *Ep.* 90, 5—6, may have been in Chapman's mind, e.g. 'sed postquam subrepentibus vitiis in tyrannidem regna conversa sunt, opus esse coepit legibus, quas et ipsas inter initia tulere sapientes.' Cf. *The Gentleman Usher*, v, iv, 56.

v. 394. Worthy the browes of Titan, worth his chaire.

A sneer at Monsieur, who is by implication compared to Phaethon; cf. 3 *Henry VI*, II, vi, 11. Did Chapman remember Tiberius's comment on Caligula: 'se...Phaëtontem orbi terrarum educare' (Suetonius, *Caligula*, 11)?

III, ii, 394—end. This scene, I suspect, expands an ancient commonplace on the subject of friendship:—'videamus, si placet, quatenus amor in amicitia progredi debeat...num Vecellinum amici regnum adpetentem, num Maelium debuerunt iuvare?' Cicero, *De Amicitia*, 11, 36 ff.; cf. an earlier technical argument on friendship in II, i, 141, with note. Such expansions of themes are not uncommon in Chapman, and friendship, particularly unequal friendship, is a favourite topic. Note e.g. the relations of Monsieur and Bussy, of Clermont and Guise in the *Revenge*, of Vandome to St Anne in *M. d'Olive*, of Clarence and Momford in *Sir Giles Goosecap*.

IV, ii, 192. A politician must, *like lightning*, melt
The very marrow, and not taint the skin:
His wayes must not be seene; the superficies
Of the *greene* Center *must not taste his feet*,
When hell is *plow'd up* with his wounding *tracts*,
And all his *harvest reap't* by hellish facts.

The blend of metaphors gives a curious example of Chapman's methods. He has to express two things, the *finesse* of the *politician*, and his ruinous impact. This is done by the figure of lightning, first on a normal scale, and then by a hyperbole, as if the earth (now substituted for the body)[2] could remain untouched outside while its interior was wrecked. But in the second part it is obvious that a different strand is blended in. I believe that he had in mind Vergil's description of Camilla, the warrior virgin,

---

[1] For a metaphor which is suggested by, though not present in Chapman's literary source, compare note on *B.C.*, IV, i, 40. Though I do not assert that the *Aeneid* determined Chapman's woodmonger metaphor, it is interesting to note that Salmoneus is disparaged by a shifting of values—he, poor fool, would imitate the thunder and lightning of Jove by torches and brass and the thunder of hoofs!

[2] See on v, iv, with quotations from *Naturales Quaestiones*, VI, 14; also on v, i, 169.

> Illa vel intactae segetis per summa volaret
> Gramina, nec teneras cursu laesisset aristas. (*Aen.* VII, 808.)

This and the metaphors suggested by it combine with the figure of the lightning to express the double character of the politician. It seems probable that Chapman, wanting an effective hyperbole to end Act IV, remembered the three poetical examples of good hyperbole in Quintilian[1]. The first is *fulminis ocior alis*; the second is quoted above; and the third is the Pindaric comparison of Hercules' onset to lightning. For *tract* see *N. E. D.*, *sb.*^{3} 10, and compare *wayes* (194).

v, i. It seems as if the sufferings of Montsurry through his wife's unfaithfulness were modelled on the torments of Hercules by Deianira's gift of the poisoned shirt. It is unnecessary to point out casual reminiscences, but we might note in passing how the Senecan language of v. 45 ff., in which Montsurry compares himself to a giant under a volcano (cf. note on v, iv), is fused with reminiscences of the Books of Revelation and Daniel. ('Ope the seven-times heat' (1st quarto) recalls the story of the fiery furnace, while the language that follows is apocalyptic.) This clue may explain the last line in the following speech:

> Use the most madding paines in her that ever 148
> Thy venoms sok'd through, making most of death, 149
> That she may weigh her wrongs with them—and then
> Stand, vengeance, on thy steepest rock, a victor!

Tamyra was to endure a long-drawn agony till a climax came. But why did vengeance stand on her 'steepest rock'? v. 149 is a clear reference to the shirt of Nessus. Deianira in *Hercules Oetaeus* desired to expiate her gift of the shirt by an agonizing death like Hercules' own:

> abrupta cautes scindat et partem mei
> ferat omne saxum...
> levis una mors est—levis? at extendi potest, etc. v. 863

Did Deianira's first wish, to be broken from the rock, set aside as it was for a longer agony, give rise to the figure of Vengeance thrusting Tamyra's broken body from her rock after long torture, and did *levis* suggest *weigh*? (Cf. v, iv, 119.) The mode of reminiscence seems to me characteristic of Chapman; cf. e.g. note on *C. & P.*, IV, v, at end.

v, i, 62—93. A network of allusions. Chapman seems to have allowed relevant scenes in Homer or Vergil to suggest a turn or figure. The common link of association is a trap for lovers.

---

[1] VIII, 6, 69–71.

> *Mont.* Come syren, sing, and dash against my rocks
> Thy ruffin gally rig'd with quench for lust:
> Sing, and put all the nets into thy voice
> With which thou drew'st into thy strumpets lap
> The spawne of Venus, and in which ye danc'd.

The Homeric reference to the *syren* is clear enough, and it is probably developed further. Another trap, namely that set by Hephaestus for Ares and Aphrodite, is almost certainly referred to in the phrase 'dancing in nets[1].' As the words 'fame growes in going[2]' show that Dido's 'scapes of vertue' were in Chapman's mind, it is not impossible that the recollection of Aeneas suggested the phrase 'spawne of Venus,' for Aeneas was Venus' son. The passage next quoted is puzzling:

> The errant wildernesse of a womans face,
> Where men cannot get out, for all the comets
> That have been lighted at it. Though they know
> That adders lie a sunning in their smiles,
> That basilisks drink their poyson from their eyes,
> And no way there to coast out to their hearts,
> Yet still they wander there, and are not stay'd
> Till they be fetter'd, nor secure before
> All cares devoure[3] them, etc.

Coast out seems again to be a reference to the *syrens*, as *fetter'd* may be to Circe. I conjecture that *syren* gives the clue to vv. 83–7. The reference to the wilderness may well be Biblical, for *sirenes* (tr. *avengid edderes* in Wycliffe) do appear in the Burden of Babylon[4]. I am unable to explain the reference to the comets, although conceivably the phrase *facies combustae vultus eorum* (*Is.* xiii, 8) may have contributed something to the idea. A Biblical reference has already appeared in v. 77.

> v, i, 169. ...and all the formes
> That her illusions have imprest in her
> Have eaten through her back.

The earth is made a living being, and conceived as turning over (contrary to the Stoic theory) because overbalanced by the impress of illusions. The reference is probably to the ancient theory that experience comes through impressions from the objects perceived. Compare *Monsieur D'Olive*, I, i, 20:

---

[1] Parrott suggests this. From the context, I think it probable that Chapman had the Homeric scene in mind whenever he uses the phrase.

[2] *Aen.*, IV, 175, noted by Boas (v. 64).

[3] 1st quarto *distract*. The change is determined by Horace's *curae edaces*.

[4] *Isaiah*, xiii. 21—2: 'Sed requiescent ibi bestiae, et replebuntur domus eorum *draconibus*, et habitabunt ibi struthiones, et pilosi saltabunt ibi:
et respondebunt ibi ululae in aedibus ejus, et *sirenes* in delubris voluptatis.'

> ...as doctrine
> Is to the soul that puts it into act,
> And *prints it full of admirable forms.*

The reason why the earth overturned may perhaps be inferred from the development of this latter figure:

> Any attaint might *disproportion* her
> Or make her graces less than *circular.*

The connexion between virtue and a spherical form in Stoic doctrine will emerge frequently in Chapman[1]. This is not necessarily a specific reference to the Copernican theory. When Montsurry says 'Now is it true, earth moves, and heaven stands still' (v. 161) he is venturing the extreme paradox for an orthodox Stoic. Cleanthes thought that Aristarchus of Samos should be indicted for impiety 'for putting in motion the Hearth of the Universe[2].' As all the imagery of the passage is Stoic, there need not be a contemporary reference.

V, iv. The dying utterance of Bussy has been condemned by commentators. Mr Boas says: 'This seems one of the few passages in the play which really deserve Dryden's strictures for "looseness of expression and gross hyperboles,"' and Mr Parrott agrees that 'we may well ask with Mr Boas what [Pindus] and Ossa symbolize, and what their melting means.' I propose to analyse the passage fully because it exhibits that over-determination of metaphor and allusion which makes Chapman an obscure poet. Let us say at once that all the metaphors are digged from one pit; in that at least he is consistent. The lines run:

> My sunne is turn'd to blood, in whose red beams 135
> Pindus and Ossa (hid in drifts of snow
> Laid on my heart and liver) from their veines
> Melt, like two hungry torrents eating rocks,
> Into the ocean of all humane life,
> And make it bitter, only with my bloud.

Like Hercules in Seneca's play, Bussy is trapped into death, and like Hercules[3], he braces himself to meet it. He will die standing, and all the earth shall lament him[4]. To his enemy, Montsurry, he leaves his sword as Hercules gives his bow to Philoctetes; each weapon shall retain the virtue its former owner 'still'd into't with charmes of spirit[1].' Then the sight of Tamyra wounded breaks his fortitude. A woman, rather than his enemies, has caused his death[2] (v. 132). The lament that follows is no doubt shortened because, although Bussy represents Hercules, the long-drawn complainings of the latter have already been given their dramatic equivalent in the rage of Montsurry (see on V, i). What do Pindus and Ossa signify then? Fallen giants or Titans were buried under mountains, and classical myth so explained volcanoes. Monsieur has already prophesied this fate for Bussy when he fell into disfavour (III, ii, 144, cf. *R. B.*, V, ii, 38). Bussy despairs because he is merely one of the giant brood stricken by Hercules, though he aspired to reach the sky. Pindus and Ossa are appropriate if we remember that Hercules' pyre was on Oeta, and that these two mountains bound the horizon as seen from that summit. Hercules himself passed through this same moment of despair:

---

[1] *Revenge*, IV, i. 139–43; *B. Tr.*, III, ii, 113–6; *Chabot*, II, iii, 138. The perfection of the *circle* is Aristotelian doctrine. In *Chabot circular* must mean *spherical.*

[4] Plutarch, *De facie in orbe lunae*, c. 6. For an allusion to Copernicus see the *Masque* (Parrott, p. 447, l. 36).

[3] *Herc. Oet.*, 1472 ff. (see also Mr Boas's notes).

[4] *Herc. Oet.*, 1522.

> giganta crede . . . . .
> . . . .
> emitte Siculo vertice ardentes, pater,
> Titanas in me, qui manu Pindon ferant
> †aut Ossa qui me monte proiecto opprimat†[3].

That is, free the giants from the volcano where I placed them for you if only they will serve me the same way and relieve my suffering.

What does their melting mean? It is a Senecan device to measure emotion in terms of heat, and Chapman is an apt pupil[4]. The heart and liver are the seats of emotion, and Tamyra's wound the source of his agony. The explanation of the passage depends upon a fusion of classical myth and Stoic science such as Seneca himself might make. Earthquakes and eruptions were explained by an analogy between the human body and the earth. A movement of the *spiritus* in the veins[5] of either set up disturbances[6]. The *veines* then of his heart and liver actually melt the mountains in two torrents, one from each organ, and this gives a measure of his emotion. Now on the Stoic theory, the hot and the cold are the causes of the motion of *spiritus*[1]. But the sun is the cause of heat and expansion[2], and therefore, if Bussy is to be the giant under the volcano, Tamyra is the source whose red beams bring about the melting. 'Eating rocks' is a reference to the lava[3].

---

[1] *Herc. Oet.*, 1648–1659.

[2] *Herc. Oet.*, 1177: Femina Herculeae necis | auctor feretur.

[3] *Herc. Oet.*, 1302, 1308–10 (Teubner; the last line is corrupt). I should perhaps add that the general interpretation of this passage was arrived at in independence of the Senecan original, which was inaccessible to me at the time, and which consequently affords an additional clue to the sense.

[4] V, i, 45 and note, and e.g. Seneca, *Phaedra* 101: 'Alitur et crescit malum | et ardet intus qualis Aetnaeo vapor | exundat antro.' Also v. 640 ff.; *Herc. Furens*, 105; *Tempest*, IV, i, 55: 'The white cold virgin snow upon my heart | Abates the ardour of my liver.'

[5] Cf. *B.C.*, III, ii, 67: 'pour'd his solid spirits | Through earth' dissolved sinews, stopp'd her veins.'

[6] Seneca, *Nat. Quaest.* VI, 14: 'sunt qui existiment spiritu quidem et nulla alia ratione tremere terram......sed quemadmodum in corpore nostro, dum bona valetudo est, *venarum* quoque imperturbata mobilitas modum servat;...ita terrae quoque, dum illis positio naturalis est, inconcussae manent; cum aliquid peccatur, tunc velut aegri corporis motus est spiritu illo, qui modestius perfluebat, icto vehementius et quassante *venas* suas, nec (ut illi paulo ante dicebant, quibus animal placet esse terram) ⟨emisso⟩.'

We can now understand why the ocean of all human life is made bitter. 'Platonici aquae elementaris partem aliam ex aere frigore coactam exstitisse dulcem, *aliam quae a terra ex ardore et incendio exhalasset, salsam*[4].' The immense grief was to turn two mountains (despite the snow) into volcanoes, and their lava-flow was enough to make the whole ocean of life bitter!

Mr Macaulay's explanation (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, VI, 256) makes the mountains and the snow stand for the numbness of death which would have oppressed him had it not been for the red beams of the sun. But Bussy says the opposite of this. His murderers could not have killed him; and the 'killing spectacle' of Tamyra wounded (his sun) brought him low. Besides, he is to melt the mountains and snow now[5], not to be numbed by them. The snow could not, as Mr Macaulay suggests, melt into torrents of bitterness. Those come from the 'veines' of his heart and liver.

A greater than Dryden has criticized such hyperboles in *Hamlet*[6]. Laertes said:

> Now pile your dust upon the quick and dead,
> Till of this flat a mountain you have made
> To o'ertop old Pelion or the skyish head
> Of blue Olympus.

This metaphor too is in terms of giants' griefs and superincumbent mountains, and Hamlet parodies it thus:

> And, if thou prate of mountains, let them throw
> Millions of acres on us, till our ground,
> Singeing its pate against the burning zone
> Make Ossa like a wart! Nay an thou'lt mouth
> I'll rant as well as thou.

---

[1] Chapman uses this notion in II, ii, 34: 'As when a fume, | Hot, drie, and grosse, within the wombe of earth | Or in her superficies begot.'...

[2] Sen., *Nat. Quaest.* v, 4: 'quae cum coacervata sunt, deinde extenuari *sole* coeperunt, quia omne, quod in angusto dilatatur, spatium maius desiderat, ventus existit.' *Bussy*, II, i, 110; III, i, 80; IV, i, 111; all imply the same general meteorological theory.

[3] Cf. Horace, *Odes*, III, 4, 73: 'iniecta monstris Terra dolet suis | maeretque partus fulmine luridum | missos ad Orcum; nec *peredit* | impositam celer ignis Aetnam.'

[4] Plutarch, *De placitis philosophorum*, III, 16.

[5] The first quarto has the stronger phrase 'endless snow' for 'drifts of snow.' All that could not prevent the melting of the rock!

[6] v, i, 239–274.

Bussy feared the fate of the earthborn, while he had hoped to be a Hercules. The simile that follows is not improbably suggested by that hero's pyre on Oeta:

> O fraile condition of strength, valour, vertue 141
> In me (like warning fire upon the top
> Of some steepe beacon, on a steeper hill)
> Made to expresse it.

All his greatness has but made his fall more of a portent (see I, i, 5 ff.). The closing metaphor prepares for the announcement of Bussy's triumph over death:

> like a falling starre
> Silently glanc't, that like a thunderbolt 145
> Look't to have *struck*, and shook the firmament!

v. 146, Qq. *stuck*. Boas, *struck*.

Parrott takes *stuck* as *pierced*, comparing V, iii, 48. But the latter passage is not a precise parallel, and in Chapman to *stick* usually means *to stop* or *stay*[1]. In particular 'stick' may be used of the fixed or permanent stars[2]. The opposition of *glanc'd* and *stuck* corresponds to the well known classical division of heavenly bodies into *transeuntes*[3] and *haerentes*. The former, e.g. falling stars, are transitory, consumed by their own flight: 'sic faces ardent, dum transeunt, sic fulmina in unum valent ictum, sic quae *transversae* eliduntur stellae.' The latter are permanent: 'nullis ignibus nisi in suo mora est—illis dico divinis, quos habet mundus aeternos, quia partes eius sunt et opera? hi autem agunt aliquid et vadunt et *tenorem suum servant paresque sunt*[4].' There is still a difficulty left, which can best be faced after the Friar's speech has been discussed.

Bussy's last words forebode his extinction like a falling star. But his 'strength, valour, vertue' entitle him, like Hercules, to rank as a fixed star. The speech of the Friar's *Umbra* must be taken as dramatically equivalent to the announcement of the apotheosis of Hercules in Seneca's play. That it was intended to have this effect is the more probable because in the first quarto it came at the end of the play, answering to the final chorus:

---

[1] E.g. *B. Tr.*, III, i, 174; V, iii, 67: 'And lightning sticks 'twixt heaven and earth amaz'd'; *B. Tr.*, V, iv, 255: 'Stick you in earth like statues' (=be stable as statues); *Chabot*, I, ii, 153; *C. and P.* III, i, 60, where both passages refer to the final rest after motion. See also on 'set' (p. 19, note 5).

[2] Cf. *Hamlet*, V, ii, 271: 'like a star...stick fiery off indeed,'=*stand in relief* (Onions, *Shakespeare Glossary*).

[3] Or *transvolantes*, *transilientes*, *praetervolantes*. Their motion is oblique, hence *glanc't*, cf. *Nat. Quaest.* II, 58.

[4] Seneca, *Nat. Quaest.* VII, 23. The whole passage should be examined.

> nunquam Stygias fertur ad umbras
> inclita virtus; vivunt fortes...

The effect of the change in the second quarto is to bring into relief the contrast between Bussy's anticipation and his destiny. The lines, full of Stoic ideas, run thus:

> Farewell! brave reliques of a compleat man,
> Look up, and see thy spirit made a starre.
> Joine flames with Hercules, and when thou set'st
> Thy radiant forehead in the firmament,
> Make the vast chrystall crack with thy receipt;
> Spread to a world of fire, and the aged skie
> Cheere with new sparks of old humanity.

The Stoic 'compleat man,' surviving the bodily 'reliques,' rose to be a star by virtue of his fiery nature. The natural place of such fixed stars was the firmament[1]. Beyond the firmament in the Ptolemaic scheme was the containing sphere of crystal, and outside that was the fiery element. Now Bussy's soul is to pass the firmament (so strong is its fiery nature) and actually to break through the hard surrounding crystal[2] to its congenial element. Thus, rather portent than fixed star, he will, by letting in the flames, cause the conflagration which was to end the old world ('aged skie')[3] and begin a new and happier order. This hyperbole may have been suggested to Chapman by the fact that the Stoics came to conceive of Hercules, the saviour and champion of order on earth, as doing a similar task in the universe as a whole. He was the *τόνος* of the universe, which owed to him what vigour and order it possessed. Even so Bussy, who desired to cleanse the court of France (III, ii), was to serve the cosmos after death! A hint of this hyperbole actually appears in the closing lines of *Hercules Oetaeus*, where Hercules is to rival Jove himself[4].

Returning to the phrase 'stuck, and shook the firmament,' we now see that, if Bussy 'sets[5]' his radiant forehead in the firmament, he will contradict his fear and fulfil his old hope completely. If he goes further, he will be the bolt that ends the old world! It is unnecessary to accept Prof. Boas's emendation, which gains plausibility from the words 'like a thunderbolt.' *Stuck* is so obviously drawn from the Stoic circle of ideas that the difficulties of the text must be faced without emending. It is as a portent or 'prodigy' (like the *Julium sidus*) that Bussy would shake the firmament—the Friar explains how. Chapman is not strictly consistent in his metaphor of the bolt (see on *H. O.* 1143 below). He has drawn it from the same sphere—celestial phenomena—but it has not precisely the same application. A thunderbolt is a disturbing shattering thing, and Bussy had hoped to be Jove's thunderbolt. Compare 'thou shalt be my eagle | And beare my thunder underneath thy wings' (III, ii, 4). In that passage he plays Hercules to the king's Jupiter, and again he describes how he will act like the devastating lightning at the end of IV, ii. That was his intention, and the old metaphor springs to his lips when he contrasts the harmless falling star with the thunderbolt. The comparison goes closely with *shook* rather than with *stuck*[1]. One might compare the Friar's speech, which also seems to waver between the conceptions of fixed star and comet, the virtuous soul and the portent.

---

[1] *H. O.*, 1433: 'en inter astra positus evasi genus | mortale tandem.' See note on *B. Tr.*, v, iv, 45, and compare Lucan's account of the rise of Pompey's soul, *Pharsalia*, IX, i.

[2] The first quarto reads *continent*; the second *chrystal*. Chapman seems to identify the firmament with the crystalline sphere.

[3] Cf. *Revenge*, v, i, 1. One can conjecture that Chapman may have had the *Julium sidus*, portending a new era, and Vergil's fourth *Eclogue* in mind.

[4] For the ascent of Bussy's spirit compare *Revenge*, I, ii, 16: 'No, that [his spirit] was not earthly; | That (rarefying the thinne and yeelding ayre) | Flew sparkling up into the *sphaere of fire* | Whence endlesse flames it sheds in my desire.' Contrast the Friar's address to Montsurry (v. 154): 'Son of the earth.'

[5] *Set* again fixes the sense of 'stuck.' Stars, other than the moon or planets, were fixed or stuck in the continent or firmament that stood between the outer and the inner

v, iv, 209. *Mont.* And as this taper though it upwards look,
Downwards must needs consume, so let our love!
As, having lost his hony, the sweet taste
Runnes into savour, and will needs retaine
A spice of his first parents, till (like life)
It sees and dies, so let our love!

'The reference is to the wax in the taper, which retains in its *savour* the mark of its origin in the hive, till transient as life, it glances with an eye of flame, and, so doing, expires' (Boas). Parrott renders *sees* by 'flashes up.' But 'glances' is plausible because it has a double meaning not possessed by the word it glosses, while 'flashes up' does not represent the original convincingly.

The comparison of love to a taper falls into two parts, as a taper may go out in two ways. In the lines quoted, it is extinguished when all the wax down to the savour is gone. In the following lines it goes

---

spheres: 'Caelestis extumus, qui reliquos omnes complectitur, arcens et *continens* ceteros, in quo sunt *infixi* illi, qui volvuntur, stellarum cursus sempiterni,' Cicero, *Somnium Scipionis*. Compare '*caelo inhaerentes*' (Cic. *Nat. Deor.* II, 54) and 'contortis Aries cum cornibus *haeret*' (ibid. II, 111). For Elizabethan use, contrast 'What man was ever *fix'd* i' th' sphere of honour' (*Chabot*, I, i, 23) with the stars that 'shot madly from their spheres.'

[1] For a similar awkward construction see *Masque* (Parrott, p. 447, l. 19). The original idea is in *H.O.*, 1143: 'ille qui pro fulmine | tuisque facibus natus in terris eram, | ad Styga revertor:......*conde me tota, pater*, | *mundi ruina*, frange quem perdis polum.' Chapman has fused two distinct thoughts of his original.

out, being inverted, by excess of wax[1]. So the first case is when love is starved (v. 208) by defect of its sustenance[2]. I venture to suggest that 'seres and dies' may be the true reading. All the savour has gone and the dry wick goes out. It may be objected that *sere* is more appropriately used of life, vegetable or animal, and its decay, but the comparison with life is suggested immediately before the word is used. Further, Chapman has the same collocation of ideas in *B. Tr.*, III, i, 39:

> Decline and *wither*; and look, whensoever
> That the pure *sap* in her [the tree] is *dried-up* quite,
> The *lamp* of all authority goes out,
> And all the blaze of princes is extinct[3].

Since writing the above I have come across a passage in Plutarch which Chapman not improbably knew. If he did, my emendation would seem to be well supported. In *Quaestiones Conviviales* VII, 4, 2, the diners discuss why the older Romans never put a light out. One of the company explains that any light is very like man's life ('like life,' v. 213) as it can be extinguished by force or go out naturally, being dried up (*ἀπομαραινομένου, μαραινόμενον*). Now if Chapman remembered this passage (and how well he did know the *Moralia*!) we can see why the drying up may have occurred to him. Montsurry, after wounding Tamyra, has yielded to entreaty and decided not to end her life. The alternative of letting their love 'dry up' is preferred. Yet though the simile is transferred from life to love, a spice of the old seems to linger in the words 'like life.' The two Greek words used by Plutarch to express the second alternative are precisely equivalent to *marcescere* or *sere*. Chapman then adds an alternative, by a characteristic refinement displaying how the taper can put *itself* out unnaturally or forcibly:

> . . . . lastly,
> As when the flame is suffer'd to look up
> It keepes his luster, but being thus turn'd downe
> (His naturall course of usefull light inverted)
> His owne stuffe puts it out, so let our love!

Chapman may treat a climax over-ingeniously or tastelessly, but he is never empty. The symbolism here seems to be as follows. The love that consumes downward and dries up is that between the husband and wife. What then is symbolized by the inversion of the taper, the leaving of the 'naturall course of usefull light,' and the extinction by excess of

---

[1] The same metaphor seems to be used in *Hamlet* IV, vii, 116–9: 'For goodness, growing to a plurisy, | dies in his own too much.' I cannot but think that the mention of the candle immediately before explains the sense of the lines quoted here.

[2] *Revenge for Honour*, v, i, 253: 'like to a flame extinguish'd | For want of matter, 't does not die, but rather | Ceases to live.'

[3] Compare also 1 *Henry VI*, II, v, 8—12.

'his owne stuffe'? The only possible answer is that Tamyra's guilty passion for Bussy has by excess destroyed their marital love (the light). Without some such explanation the close of the play is empty rhetoric.

With the Plutarch passage in mind, we may now interpret the lines which precede the simile:

> I...wish that mine honour 205
> Would suffer reconcilement to my love:
> But, since it will not, honour never serve
> My love with flourishing object, till it sterve!
> And as this taper . . . . .

'Flourishing' seems to mean, 'that which makes love to flourish.' Chapman already had the taper in mind, and the 'object' is the wax. Compare *τῷ μὲν οὖν ἱερῷ πρὸς ἀμφοτέρας* [φθορὰς] *ἀρήγειν, ἀεὶ τρέφοντας καὶ φυλάττοντας,* and again *ἵνα μὴ μάτην τρέφοιτο* (Plutarch, *ibidem*). I had at first thought of 'nourishing,' but 'flourishing' is more in Chapman's manner and gives an absolute antithesis to 'sterve.' Again, if Chapman had Plutarch in mind, we must conceive of honour as 'serving' (*φυλάττων*) the flame of love with its proper nutriment like a priest. It may be added that 'serving' is appropriate to tending a lamp, as in Plutarch, but hardly to a single taper as in Chapman's comparison. But this is not felt, as the simile is still undeveloped, and a taper was necessarily substituted for a lamp if the reversal was to be carried out on the stage.

'THE REVENGE OF BUSSY D'AMBOIS.'

I, i, 351.

> And besides
> That all things have been likened to the mirth 352
> Us'd upon stages, and for stages fitted,
> The splenative philosopher, that ever
> Laught at them all 355

There has been some discussion about the origin of the sentiment in vv. 352–3. But the reference to Democritus shows that Chapman had in mind the maxim attributed to him in the 'golden sayings': *ὁ κόσμος σκηνή, ὁ βίος πάροδος.*

I, ii. Prof. Parrott has noted that Tamyra's second speech is from Plutarch's *Conjugalia Praecepta*, 14. It answers an argument also taken from the same source, c. 29.

III, i, 83.

> *Aum.* Who knowes not
> The bumbast politie thrusts into his gyant,
> To make his wisedome seeme of size as huge, 85
> And all for sleight encounter of a shade,
> So hee be toucht, hee would have hainous made?

Parrott considers that the lines refer to a 'bugbear' erected by *politie*. Rather a giant exhibited by *politie*. The metaphor illustrates the stir made to seize Clermont, and Aumale says that it is disproportionate to Clermont's real importance. Clermont is the 'shade' not the 'bugbear'; and the giant (politie's gyant) stuffed with bumbast is the great display of troops. Here we have another example of Chapman's favourite figure of the overblown image of statecraft (cf. I, i, 342). In short, an elaborate machinery appears to indicate an opponent hard to overcome, and by inference a skilled mind in control of the machinery. 'Hainous made' is rendered by 'is harmed thereby.' I do not see how the touching can affect the 'hainousness' of Clermont. One would expect *hainous* to explain the expressions 'sleight encounter of a shade' and 'so hee be toucht.' Is not the sense this? 'You need have no giant to encounter a mere shade—that is but your display; if you touched him, he would fall[1].' I venture to suggest that the text is defective, and that *ruinous* may be the required word. Maillard defends the preparations by saying 'This must fall | Past shadowes *waights*' (vv. 92–3). For this sense of *ruinous* = brought to ruin, cf. N.E.D.[2]

III, ii, 29—60. Cp. Plutarch, *Praecepta Gerendae Reipublicae*, c. 27.

IV, v, 33. And as of Homers verses, many critickes
On those stand of which times old moth hath eaten
The first or last feete, and the perfect parts
Of his unmatched poeme sinke beneath,
With upright gasping and sloath dull as death.

Upright gasping. Parrott tentatively suggests 'complete incapacity.' The metaphor however seems to be of men who stand on boggy ground instead of the firm soil, so 'upright gasping' is a vivid phrase for their immersion—they are over neck in the slough. The subject of 'sinke' is 'critickes.'

V, i, 37. *Guise*. that admired voyce
That at the barricadoes spake to mee,
(No person seene) 'Let's leade my lord to Reimes.'

The incident in Grimeston recalls to Chapman the fateful vision of Brutus, who was warned by his evil spirit that 'thou shalt see me by the city of Philippes.' This association gives a certain body to the presage. Chapman then makes Clermont explain the voice away by an *Epicurean* theory of dreams. This was appropriate in the mouth of Cassius

---

[1] Cf. *B. Tr.*, IV, ii, 273: 'A property for a tyrant to set up | And puff down with the vapour of his breath.'

[2] I had not observed that the first part of this note agrees with Mr Boas's rendering.

(Plutarch, *Brutus*), but hardly fits the Stoic Clermont, who is Brutus reborn (II, i, 106). There is however a dramatic irony in Clermont's speech, since Bussy's *Umbra* stands in view of the audience and is to convince him in a moment that visions do appear to men. So Guise reverses the situation :

> *Gui.* *Thou* dream'st awake now ; what was here to see ? 102
> *Cler.* My brother's spirit, urging his revenge.

A. S. FERGUSON.

KINGSTON, CANADA.

DRYDEN NOT THE AUTHOR OF ‘MACFLECKNOE.’

I.

MacFlecknoe, or a Satyr upon the True-Blew-Protestant Poet, T.S. By the Author of Absalom and Achitophel. London, Printed for D. Green, 1682.

THIS poem has hitherto been attributed to Dryden; the object of this paper is to show that its real author was John Oldham. The reasons for considering Dryden to be the author may be summarized as follows:

(1) It appeared on October 4, 1682, soon after Dryden had been bitterly attacked by Thomas Shadwell in *The Medal of John Bayes.*

(2) The title page of the first edition stated that it was, ‘By the Author of Absalom and Achitophel.’

(3) In his *Essay on Satire,* prefixed to the translation of Juvenal which appeared in 1693, Dryden writes: ‘and (if it be not too vain to mention anything of my own) the poems of *Absalom and Achitophel* and *MacFlecknoe.*’

(4) In 1701, when J. Tonson issued Dryden's *Poems on Several Occasions etc., MacFlecknoe* was included, and it has been incorporated with Dryden's works ever since.

(5) In Spence's *Anecdotes,* Dryden is represented as saying: ‘If anything of mine is good, 'tis *MacFlecno*; and I value myself the more upon it because 'tis the first piece of ridicule written in Heroics.’

(6) As regards the poetical qualities of *MacFlecknoe,* Scott considers Dryden's authorship certain because ‘there existed no contemporary poet to whom so masterly a production could have been ascribed[1],’ and Hallam in his *Literature of Europe*[2] tells us that, ‘we must allow for the inferiority of the subject, which could not bring out so much of Dryden's higher powers of mind, but scarcely one of his poems is more perfect.’

---

[1] *Dryden,* Vol. x, p. 431, ed. 1808.

[2] Vol. iv, p. 146.

Despite these apparently satisfactory reasons for attributing the authorship to Dryden, two difficulties have presented themselves to his editors. Sir Walter Scott, who may be regarded as his proto-editor, dealt with both of them; all later editors have substantially endorsed his views.

The first difficulty is Shadwell's statement, printed in 1687 in his Introduction to his Translation to Juvenal's Tenth Satire, that Dryden, when he approached him on the subject, denied the authorship 'with all the execrations he could think of.' As to this we read in Scott's and Saintsbury's *Dryden*[1]: 'we cannot believe Shadwell's assertion,' and most other editors treat Shadwell as a liar. Christie[2] writes: 'Dryden may have felt himself entitled to deny when questioned by Shadwell,' and adds: 'but Dryden's authorship could not be, and of course was not, a secret,' so Dryden's denial was useless, as well as cowardly, if we take Christie's view (which, however, is not strengthened by any evidence). Bayne[3] is even more sweeping; he states that there is 'abundant proof that Dryden made no secret of the authorship,' but no tittle of proof is given; this is unfortunate as Ward[4] declares that Dryden 'does not appear to have acknowledged it as his before 1692[5].'

The second difficulty lies in the fact that, if *MacFlecknoe* was written by Dryden, he made an elaborate attack on Shadwell in October and then gave him a second trouncing in November. The lines devoted to him, under the name of Og, in *Absalom and Achitophel, Part II* are universally allowed to be Dryden's. Scott[6] explains the double attack thus: 'having divided his (Shadwell's) poetical character from that which he held as a political writer, he discussed the first in the satire which follows (i.e. *MacFlecknoe*) and the last, with equal severity, in the Second Part of *Absalom and Achitophel*.' Christie[7] writes: 'Though the second part of *Absalom and Achitophel* was published after *MacFlecknoe*, Dryden's lines in the other poem were probably written before he honoured Shadwell with exclusive attention in *MacFlecknoe*.' Hooper in his *Life of Dryden*[8] remarks: 'The brief interval that occurred could hardly have given Shadwell time to have recovered from his painful astonishment before he was again impaled.'

---

[1] Vol. I, p. 223.

[2] *Dryden*, 'Globe' series, ed. 1894, p. 142.

[3] *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, article *Shadwell*.

[4] *Cambridge History of English Literature*, Vol. VIII, p. 40.

[5] The acknowledgement to which Ward refers is, I suppose, the sentence already quoted from the *Essay on Satire* (1693), which Ward assumes to have been written in 1692. If Dryden in that sentence intended to suggest that he had written *MacFlecknoe*, he expressed himself so artfully that it would always be open to him to deny that his claim extended to anything besides *Absalom and Achitophel*.

[6] *Dryden*, Vol. x, p. 429, ed. 1808.

[7] *Dryden*, 'Globe,' ed. 1894, p. lii.

[8] Bell's ed. 1866, p. lvi.

I have endeavoured to state the case for Dryden clearly and impartially, I now proceed with the case for John Oldham.

II.

Oldham was born in 1653 and died in 1683. He graduated from St Edmund's Hall, Oxford, taking his B.A. in 1674. In 1681 his first book, *Satyrs upon the Jesuits,* was published anonymously ; in this year another slim volume appeared, entitled *Some New Pieces,* which was followed by *Poems and Translations* early in 1683. Both these later volumes were stated to be 'By the Author of Satyrs upon the Jesuits.' In 1684 Joseph Hindmarsh, who had been his publisher throughout, issued *Remains of Mr. John Oldham in Verse and Prose ;* these four volumes (with the addition of two Odes which appeared later) formed Oldham's *Works,* of which editions appeared in 1684, 1686, 1694, 1698, 1703 and 1710. In 1722 an anonymous editor published the *Works* in two volumes with a life of the poet and short notes, and this edition was badly re-edited by Captain E. Thompson in 1770, in three volumes. For nearly one hundred years nothing further was done; in 1854 there appeared a selection from his poems, with a Memoir and notes by R. Bell, in the series called Bell's *Annotated Poets.* The text was not printed from the first editions, lines were altered in deference to Early-Victorian susceptibilities, and there were some ludicrous misprints.

Oldham stood high in the estimation of contemporaries, as the praises of Dryden, Jacob, and T. Brown, in his *Essay on Modern Satyr,* show. Of later writers, Hallam ranks him second to Dryden, and Courthope and others admit that he was the forerunner of Dryden and Pope. We must remember that Dryden published no satirical poems until after the appearance of *Satyrs upon the Jesuits.*

In the course of my present work in preparing a critical edition of Oldham, I examined an important manuscript[1] in the Bodleian Library. This MS. is entirely in Oldham's hand. It is a made-up volume of sheets originally separate, some of them the covers of letters addressed to him. The contents are of two kinds; many drafts for poems written out roughly on the backs of boys' exercises, envelopes, etc., and a number of poems copied out fair for the printer, or to hand to friends. These fair copies are almost all dated and, in the case of published poems, the dates agree with those printed; in some cases the place of composition is also given. Amongst these I found *MacFleckno, A Satyr*, the date, A° 1678, being written in the top left-hand corner of the paper opposite the title, as was done in the case of the other poems.

---

[1] *Rawlinson*, poet. 123; 14616 in the Summary Catalogue.

The question which immediately arose was this: How came it that a poem, supposedly written by Dryden to punish Shadwell for an attack made on him in 1682, should be fair copied by Oldham in 1678? The first thing to be done was, if possible, to discover more about the circumstances under which *MacFlecknoe* appeared in print. On turning to the first edition I found, on the last page, a printed statement which has been overlooked or ignored by all Dryden's editors; it runs thus: 'A Gentleman having a curious Collection of Poetry by the most Ingenious of the Age, Intends to oblige the World with a Poem every Wednesday Morning, and with all the New ones as they come to his hand. Sold by most Booksellers.'

October 4 is universally accepted as the day on which *MacFlecknoe* appeared, and in 1682 that day was a Wednesday. It seems clear, therefore that *MacFlecknoe* was one of the poems in the collection of this Gentleman and that he, realizing the interest aroused by Dryden's *Medal* and the answers to it, and possibly sympathizing with Dryden, determined to publish the satire on Flecknoe and Shadwell which was in his possession. Ignorant, apparently, of the authorship, he, or D. Green, decided to attribute the poem to the author of *Absalom and Achitophel.* It is to be remembered that the authorship of this piece was not at first generally known, for we find in later editions laudatory verses, which had been written upon 'the unknown Author,' prefixed to it. Whether any of Dryden's editors have examined the first edition of *MacFlecknoe* does not appear; Scott writes[1]: 'The first edition of *MacFlecnoe* the present editor has never seen. It was published not by Tonson but by D. Green.' He thanks Malone for a transcript of the title page, and seems interested in Dryden's sudden change of publisher.

The theory I put forward is, therefore, as follows:

(1) That a manuscript of *MacFlecknoe* had been in a Gentleman's hands for some time.

(2) That he sympathized with Dryden and published the poem, through D. Green, as satirizing Shadwell.

(3) That Shadwell's statement regarding Dryden's denial of the authorship is perfectly true.

---

[1] *Dryden*, Vol. x, p. 431, ed. 1808.

(4) That the 'double attack,' therefore, by Dryden on Shadwell never took place.

Indeed this supposed double attack is quite inconsistent with all that we know concerning Dryden's attitude towards detractors. Many minor poets were never tired of sneering at 'Jack Squab,' or 'Little Bayes,' and he bore their attacks with contemptuous patience. That he should satirize Shadwell *once* is not surprising, but that he should make elaborate onslaughts on a former friend twice in six weeks passes the bounds of probability.

As has been mentioned, the Oldham MS. of *MacFlecknoe* is dated 1678; the subject-matter of the poem gives this date much significance:

> All humane things are subject to decay,
> And when Fate summons Monarchs must obey;
> This Flecknoe found, who, ...
> ....
> Worn out with business, did at length debate
> To settle the succession of his State.

The accepted (though uncertain) date of Flecknoe's death is 1678, which rests apparently on a rather obscure passage in Dryden's dedication of *The Kind Keeper, or Mr Limberham* which appeared in 1678. In that passage he speaks of 'the connection of thought...betwixt a bad poet and Fleckno,' and assigns to Flecknoe 'the Omen of dulness.' One wonders if these words of Dryden suggested the form of Oldham's satire on Shadwell. Dryden at this time had not broken with Shadwell. He wrote a prologue to Shadwell's *True Widow* in 1679. I think it is highly probable that the news of Flecknoe's serious illness, or death, inspired Oldham with the idea elaborated in *MacFlecknoe*.

III.

Some examination of Oldham's habits as an author will help us to understand that there was nothing surprising in the circumstances under which *MacFlecknoe* appeared. Bell[1] relates how, while an usher in the free-school at Croydon, 'he produced several pieces, some of which, obtaining circulation in MS....rendered their author an object of curiosity to the town wits and critics.' Courthope[2] states that Oldham's verses circulated widely in manuscript. Gosse[3] informs us that 'from 1675—1678...his satires were beginning to be shewn from hand to hand in MS.' Oldham's generosity produced the results usual in those days, namely, pirated editions, incorrect attributions, and thefts of his poems, temporary or otherwise.

---

[1] *Oldham*, p. 8, ed. 1854.

[2] *History of English Poetry*, Vol. III, p. 499.

[3] *English Literature*, Vol. III, p. 147.

The vicissitudes of *A Satyr against Vertue* are highly instructive. In the Advertisement to his first volume Oldham complains that the poem was not, at first, intended for publication, 'nor to pass beyond the privacy of two or three Friends but...it had the Fate to steal abroad in Manuscript and afterwards in Print.' What happened was this. The fair copy in the Bodleian MS. is dated, 'July 1676, Croydon'; a pirated edition, crowded with errors, appeared anonymously in 1679; in 1680 the poem was printed in the so-called Antwerp edition of Rochester's Works; Oldham printed it in his first volume in 1681, and it was omitted from the 1685 and 1696 editions of Rochester's poems; but, in spite of the fact that it had appeared in each of the eight editions of *Satyrs upon the Jesuits* issued between 1681 and 1710, it was again included in Rochester's Works in the edition of 1712. *A Satyr against Mankind* has remained a permanent theft from Oldham by the editors of Rochester, a fault which will be rectified in my edition of Oldham. Lastly, elaborate drafts for some peculiarly virulent lines *Upon the Author of the Play call'd Sodom* are to be found amongst Oldham's manuscripts, yet, though Rochester was the author of *Sodom*, they were given to him in the edition of 1718. Dr von Roemer[1], who reprints them as Rochester's, accounts for them by explaining that *Sodom* roused such disgust that Rochester sat down and attacked himself to remove further suspicion of being the author!

After all this, is it surprising that Oldham has been robbed of *MacFlecknoe*? The Bodleian MS. has not been indexed by any former owner and I am, apparently, the first person who has had occasion to make a thorough examination of it. Bell's edition was based only on printed texts. The MS. of *MacFlecknoe* in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth is undated, and is not written either by Oldham or Dryden; it differs only slightly from the Bodleian MS. and from the editions of 1682 and 1684, and need here be given no more than a passing mention.

IV.

The internal evidence of authorship afforded by *MacFlecknoe* must now be considered. An important point to notice is that in a satire supposed to have been written to pillory Shadwell, the treatment accorded to Flecknoe is equally severe. The longer the interval we suppose to have elapsed between Flecknoe's death and the composition of the satire, the more difficult it becomes to account for the attack on *him* in a poem directed against another: we may well think that Dryden would have been too magnanimous to chastise, in 1682, a man who had died four years before. If Oldham wrote the poem in 1678 circumstances were different, and we have, moreover, no grounds for attributing to him any great delicacy of feeling. That he had a special contempt for Flecknoe is seen in his other works: e.g. in *Horace his Art of Poetry Imitated* he says of every poet:

---

[1] *Kruptadia*, Vol. IX.

> He must a Cowley or a Flecknoe be,
> For there's no second Rate in Poetry:

thus putting Flecknoe in the lowest rank of contemporary poets.

When comparing *MacFlecknoe* with Dryden's other work in satire, Gosse[1] declares that 'the manner is more closely that of Boileau.' Of all French seventeenth century poets none was better known to Oldham than Boileau. Besides his imitation of Satire VIII, *De l'Homme*, and his translation of Satire V, *La Noblesse*, the Bodleian MS. contains a translation of *Le Lutrin, Chant I*, which has not yet been published. Therefore we should expect to find Boileau's influence apparent in *MacFlecknoe.*

Four lines in *MacFlecknoe* are a flippant imitation of lines in Cowley's *Davideis, Book I*; Oldham's debt to Cowley was considerable, and the poem called *A Satyr against Vertue* is written 'In Imitation of Mr Cowley.'

The lines in *MacFlecknoe* in praise of Ben Jonson may appear characteristic of Dryden (though in his prologue to *Albumazar* Dryden had practically charged Jonson with plagiarism), but they are no less characteristic of Oldham, who declared, in his poem *Upon the Works of Ben. Johnson* that this poet's writings could:

> Stand the sharpest Censure, and defie the rigid'st Test.

In *MacFlecknoe* the Prince of Dullness says to Shadwell:

> Thou art my Blood where Johnson hath no part,
> What share have we in Nature or in Art?

and in Oldham's Ode we read:

> Nature and Art together met and joyn'd,
> Made up the Character of thy great Mind.

Christie, who was probably acquainted with a volume entitled *MacFlecknoe: a poem by J. Dryden; with Spencer's ghost: a satyr concerning poetry by J. Oldham;* 1709. quotes passages from the latter poem in illustration of the former; the parallel passages which follow were arranged by me independently of those in Christie's edition of Dryden.

---

[1] *English Literature*, Vol. III, p. 147.

Pope[1] declared that Oldham was a very indelicate writer, and that his 'strong rage' was too much like Billingsgate. This coarseness is observable in *MacFlecknoe.* The metaphor of pregnancy and parturition is constantly used in speaking of the workings of an author's brain; thus in *MacFlecknoe* we read:

> Success let others teach, learn thou from me
> Pangs without birth etc.:

and Shadwell is described as

> Big with Hymn.

So in Oldham's ode *To the Memory of Mr. Charles Morwent:*

> Thy pregnant Mind ne'er struggled in its Birth,
> But quick, and while it did conceive brought forth;
> The gentle Throes of thy prolifick Brain
> Were all unstrain'd and without Pain.

again, in *A Letter, etc.:*

> How when the Fancy lab'ring for a Birth,
> With unfelt Throes brings the rude issue forth.

also, in *A Satyr concerning Poetry*:

> ....how each Line
> Is big with Sense!

Regarding the fate of authors' works, we read in *MacFlecknoe*:

> From dusty shops neglected Authors come
> Martyrs of Pies and relicts of the Bum.
> Much Heywood, Shirley, Ogilby there lay
> But loads of Shadwell almost choak'd the way.
> Bilk'd Stationers for yeomen stood prepar'd etc.

Compare with this the following passages from *A Satyr concerning Poetry*:

> Whose works must serve the next Election-Day
> For making Squibs, and under pies to lay.
>
> Then who'll not laugh to see th' Immortal Name
> To vile Mundungus made a martyr Flame?[2]
> And all thy deathless Monuments of Wit
> Wipe Porters' Tails, etc.
>
> How many poems..................................
> ....
> Have grown contemptible...........................
> As Pordage, Fleckno, or the British Prince?
> Quarles, Chapman, Heywood, Withers had Applause,
> And Wild and Ogilby in former days;
> But now are damn'd to wrapping Drugs and Wares
> And curs'd by all their broken Stationers.

---

[1] Spence's *Anecdotes*, p. 19, ed. 1820.

[2] *i.e.* torn up and used as pipe lighters.

Speaking of his own poems Oldham says: ''tis no great matter... whether Ode, Elegy, or Satyr have the honour of Wiping first.' We may say then that *MacFlecknoe* shows a particular strain of coarseness, alien to Dryden but thoroughly congenial to Oldham.

Once more; Flecknoe cries to his successor:

> Trust Nature, do not labour to be dull,
> But write thy best and top, etc.

So in *Horace his Art of Poetry Imitated*:

> But each conceited Dunce..............
> Sets up for Poetry, and dares engage
> With all the topping Writers of the Age.

In *MacFlecknoe* these lines occur:

> As Hannibal did to the Altars come
> Sworn by his Sire a mortall Foe to Rome.

So, in *Satyrs upon the Jesuits*:

> As the great Carthaginian heretofore
> The bloody reeking Altar touch'd, and swore
> Eternal enmity to the Roman pow'r.

Lastly, in *MacFlecknoe*:

> On his left hand twelve reverend owls did fly.

and in *Satyrs upon the Jesuits*:

> And reverend bears their doctrines did confute.

Other parallels might be added, but those given above will surely prove that *MacFlecknoe* bears evident traces of Oldham's workmanship.

V.

The last point to be dealt with is the date at which Dryden adopted *MacFlecknoe* as his own. In Scott's *Dryden*, as revised by Saintsbury[1], it is stated that he did not include *MacFlecknoe* in his first printed list of plays and poems. That he had not publicly adopted it for his own in 1687, Shadwell's statement of his denial seems good evidence. In fact there is no proof that he laid public claim to the authorship earlier than 1693, and even then he did so, if at all, in most ambiguous terms. It is important to notice that Shadwell died in 1692, so that Dryden was safe from any revival by him of the story which he had told in 1687.

As regards Lockier's conversation with Dryden, related in Spence's *Anecdotes*[2], Dryden's remark has been quoted at the beginning of this article. Lockier's objection to Dryden's statement is worth noting. 'I named Boileau's *Lutrin* and Tassoni's *Secchia Rapita*; which I had read, and knew Dryden had borrowed some strokes from each. "'Tis true" said Dryden. "I had forgot them."' Now if Dryden had written *MacFlecknoe* and had been indebted to *Le Lutrin* for 'some strokes,' is it likely he could have so far forgotten it as to make the claim he did for *MacFlecknoe*? On the other hand, Oldham had not only studied *Le Lutrin* but had made a finished translation of the First Canto. This curious admission of forgetfulness by Dryden seems to me to strengthen the case for Oldham's authorship. Singer, following Malone's researches, makes this conversation take place about 1685. At this date Oldham had been dead for more than a year. To dismiss Spence's story as a mere fabrication seems impossible; we are therefore faced with the rather ugly conclusion that Dryden, seeing the success of *MacFlecknoe*, and trading on its erroneous attribution to the Author of *Absalom and Achitophel*, fell in with the general opinion as to its authorship and adopted it as his own. When the facts are fairly faced, it seems certain to the writer of this article that he has succeeded in restoring valuable property to its real owner.

---

[1] Vol. I, p. 223.

[2] ed. by Singer, 1820; p. 59.

PERCY L. BABINGTON.

CAMBRIDGE.

ANTOINE DE LA SALE AND THE DOUBTFUL WORKS[1].

I.

Few writers of the fifteenth century have been the object of more investigations than Antoine de la Sale, the author of *Le Petit Jehan de Saintré*, to whom two other important works, *Les Quinze Joyes de Mariage* and *Les Cents Nouvelles Nouvelles*, have been assigned by some and denied, either as regards one or both of these works, by others.

---

[1] Bibliography: Legrand d'Aussy, *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi*, 1799, t. v, pp. 392–7; André Pottier, *Lettre à M. Techener*, *Revue de Rouen*, Oct., 1830; M. Génin, *Athenaeum Français*, March, 1854, p. 228; C. Magnin, *Journal des Savants*, 1856, p. 74; Paul Lacroix, *Bulletin du Bouquiniste*, 1859, p. 5; *E. T.* (of Brest), *Bulletin du Bouquiniste*, 1859, p. 123; Kervyn de Lettenhove, *La dernière Sibylle*, *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique*, ii$^{\text{e}}$ série, t. xiii, 1862, pp. 405–15; Ludwig Stern, *Versuch über Antoine de la Sale des xv. Jahrhunderts*, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, vol. xlvi, 2, 1870, pp. 113—218; E. Gossart, *Antoine de la Salle, sa vie et ses œuvres inédites*, *Le Bibliophile Belge*, Brussels, 1871, pp. 5—17, 45—56, 77—88, re-issued in book form with a few improvements, but many uncorrected errors, in 1902 (Brussels). See review by W. Foerster, *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie*, Dec., 1903; A. Lecoy de la Marche, *Le Roi René*, 2 vols., Paris, 1875—for Antoine de la Sale see vol. ii, p. 126; Joseph Nève, *Du Réconfort de Madame du Fresne, suivi de la Journée d'honneur et de prouesse et de plusieurs fragments inédits par Antoine de la Salle*......Brussels, 1881, as no. 14 of the *Publications de la Société des Bibliophiles de Belgique*; J. Stecher, *Les deux la Salle*, *Athenaeum Belge*, Nov. 15, 1883, p. 167; J. U. Schmidt, *Syntactische Studien über die Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* (Zurich diss.), Frauenfeld, 1888; Pietro Toldo, *Contributo allo studio della novella francese del xv e xvi secolo*......Rome, 1895. See important review by G. Paris in the *Journal des Savants*, 1895, reproduced in G. Paris, *Mélanges de Littérature française du Moyen Age*, publiés par Mario Roques, Paris, 1912, pp. 627—677; Petit de Julleville, *Revue des Cours et Conférences*, Dec., 1895, p. 217 ff.; *id.*, *Histoire de la Langue et de la Littérature française*, vol. ii, 1896, pp. 394—397; G. Paris, *Le Paradis de la Reine Sybille et la Légende du Tannhäuser*, *Revue de Paris*, Dec., 1897 and March, 1898, reprinted in his *Légendes du Moyen Age*, Paris, 1903, pp. 67—145; Werner Söderhjelm, *Antoine de la Sale et la Légende du Tannhäuser*, *Mémoires de la Société Néo-philologique à Helsingfors*, vol. ii, 1897, pp. 101—167. See review by G. Paris in *Romania*, xxvii, p. 304; H. Suchier in H. Suchier und A. Birch-Hirschfeld, *Geschichte der französischen Literatur*, Leipzig and Vienna, 1900, p. 252; G. Doutrepont et Baron F. Béthune, *La Sale*, *Bulletin d'Histoire linguistique et littéraire française des Pays Bas*, years 1901 and 1902–3, Bruges, 1903 and 1906; Gaston Raynaud, *Un Nouveau Manuscrit du Petit Jehan de Saintré*, *Romania*, xxxi, 1902, pp. 527—556; G. Gröber, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, Strassburg, 1902, pp. 1151—1154; Otto Soelter, *Beiträge zur Überlieferung der 'Quinze Joyes de Mariage' mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Handschrift von St. Petersburg* (Greifswald diss.), Greifswald, 1902; Joseph Nève, *Antoine de la Salle, Sa Vie et ses Ouvrages, d'après des documents inédits......suivi du Réconfort de Madame du Fresne......du Paradis de la Reine Sibylle, etc., par Antoine de la Salle, et de fragments et de documents inédits......*, Paris and Brussels, 1903. See Review by Gaston Raynaud, *Romania*, xxxiii, 1904, pp. 107—111, by E. Langlois, *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartres*, lxv, 1904, pp. 211–2, by W. Foerster, *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie*, Dec., 1903; *Une Énigme d'Histoire littéraire: l'auteur des xv Joyes de Mariage*, Paris, 1903,

The problems that arise in discussing the question of Antoine de la Sale's disputed works are so intimately connected with the man's life and character as well as with the nature of his other works, that we may be excused for dwelling at some length on what might otherwise appear irrelevant matter, the more so as the main facts in his life have been brought to light only comparatively recently. Gossart was the first to elicit certain assured data from an examination of the unpublished and lesser known works, previous biographers having been content to reproduce the few details found in his reprinted works, and in Legrand d'Aussy's defective notice.

Recently, thanks to the labours of Pierre Champion, working for Joseph Nève, and more particularly of L. H. Labande, in the archives of the Bouches du Rhône, important documents have been unearthed, which make it possible to present a fairly complete picture of this extraordinary man's career, though the latter part of his life still needs elucidation.

Antoine de la Sale was born in Provence, as we gather from a remark

---

without name of author, printer or publisher. Review by J. Bédier, *Romania*, xxxiii, 1904, pp. 438—440, by J. Brice, *Revue Biblio-iconographique*, 1903, pp. 354—356, by E. Langlois, *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, lxv, 1904, pp. 213—215, by W. Foerster, *Literaturblatt für germ. und rom. Phil.*, Dec., 1903; A. Dressler, *Die Chantilly-Hs. der 'Quinze Joyes de Mariage,' herausgegeben und erläutert* (Greifswald diss.), Greifswald, 1903; A. Fleig, *Der Treperel-Druck der Quinze Joyes de Mariage* (Greifswald diss.), Greifswald, 1903; A. Bayot, *Le Roman de Gillion de Trazegnies, Recueil……des Conférences……de Louvain*, 1903, 12^{e} fasc.; L. H. Labande, *Antoine de la Salle, Nouveaux Documents sur sa Vie et ses Relations avec la Maison d'Anjou, Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, vol. lxv, 1904, pp. 55—100 and pp. 321—354. See Review by G. Raynaud, *Romania*, xxxiv, 1905, p. 317; Carl Haag, *Antoine de la Sale und die ihm zugeschriebenen Werke, Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, vol. cxiii, 1904, pp. 101—135 and pp. 315—351; O. Grojean, *Antoine de la Sale, Revue de l'Instruction Publique en Belgique*, vol. xlvii, 1904, pp. 153—187; Werner Söderhjelm, *Notes sur Antoine de la Sale et ses Œuvres, Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae*, vol. xxxii, no. i, Helsingfors, 1904. See Review by F. E. Schneegans, *Literaturblatt für germ. und rom. Phil.*, May, 1906, by A. Schulze, *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*, xxx^{2}, p. 10; W. P. Shepard, *The Syntax of Antoine de la Sale, Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, vol. xx, New Series vol. xiii, 1905, pp. 435—501; G. Paris, *La Poésie du Moyen Age*, ii^{e} Série, Paris, 1906, p. 253; W. Küchler, *Die Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der französischen Novelle, Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*, vol. xxx^{1}, 1906, pp. 264—331; G. Paris, *Esquisse Historique de la Littérature Française au Moyen Age*, Paris, 1907, p. 246; A. Biedermann, *Zur Syntax des Verbums bei Antoine de la Sale*, Erlangen, 1907; L. Jordan, *Antoine de la Salle und der 'Petit Jehan de Saintré,' Philologische und volkskundliche Arbeiten Karl Vollmoeller zum 16 Oktober 1908 dargeboten*; Werner Söderhjelm, *Les Inspirateurs des Quinze Joyes de Mariage, Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar*, ii, 1908–9; G. Doutrepont, *La Littérature Française à la Cour des Ducs de Bourgogne*, Paris, 1909. See especially pp. 91—100 and 337—342; Werner Söderhjelm, *La Nouvelle Française au xv^{e} siècle*, Paris, 1910; Marcel Lecourt, *Antoine de la Sale et Simon de Hesdin*, in *Mélanges offerts à M. Emile Chatelain*, Paris, 1910, pp. 341—353; E. Allison Peers, *The Authorship of certain Prose Works ascribed to Antoine de la Sale, Modern Philology*, vol. xiv, 1906, pp. 85—92. See also the Introduction to the several editions of *Saintré*, *Les Quinze Joyes de Mariage*, and *Les Cents Nouvelles Nouvelles*; and the articles on Antoine de la Sale in the *Nouvelle Biographie Générale* (Vallet de Viriville) and in the *Grande Encyclopédie* (Jeanroy).

of his in the *Réconfort de Madame du Fresne*, to the effect that he was 'esquier de la comté de Provence,' almost certainly in the diocese of Avignon, between Tarascon and Saint-Rem, on the domain bequeathed to his father by Queen Marie of Blois (Labande, *loc. cit.*, p. 316). He was the illegitimate son of Bernard de la Sale, a renowned *condottiere*, who had warred in France, Spain and Italy, and whose eventful life reads like a romance of adventure. His mother, of whom little is known, was called Perrinette Damendel, and was undoubtedly of Provençal origin. From a passage (Gossart, *loc. cit.*, 1871, pp. 80—81) in the prologue to *La Sale* (1451), one of his pedagogic works, a simple calculation reveals the fact that he was born in 1388, though Labande is inclined to think that Antoine de la Sale's memory must have played him false on that occasion, and that his birth occurred in 1387[1], or, more probably, in 1386[2]. Young Antoine was only four or five years old when his father fell in battle; but the boy must have been carefully brought up and educated, for his writings give proof of extensive culture, which he in all probability acquired principally in the neighbouring town of Avignon. At the age of fourteen, after having spent his early youth in Provence, he entered the service of Louis II of Anjou as a page; went with this prince to Italy and penetrated as far as Sicily, where he notes his own presence at Messina in 1407, in *La Salade*, his first work, and gives a detailed account of the attempt he and his friends made to ascend Stromboli (Nève, *op. cit.*, 1903, p. 159). Soon after, in the year 1408, he appears, according to a passage in his *Des Anciens Tournois*, to have made a short stay at the Burgundian Court, and would seem to have been there again in 1412 or 1413. In the interval between his two visits to the Burgundian Court he was at Pisa in 1409, and later wrote a summary account of Louis VII's Italian campaign, of which he was an eye-witness. In 1414 we see him engaged in transactions with the inhabitants of Figeac, to recover certain sums of money owing to his father. In the summer of 1415 Antoine de la Sale found an excellent opportunity of satisfying his love of adventure and travel; he joined as a volunteer and substitute (he himself tells us so in the *Réconfort*) in the pompous crusade, directed by the King of Portugal against the infidels of Morocco, which ended in the conquest of Ceuta (Nève, *op. cit.*, p. 141 ff.). On the death of Louis of Anjou (April 30th, 1417), he entered the service of his heir, Louis XIII, and was in high favour with the Queen-Mother, Yolande of Aragon, who rewarded him liberally for his services to her husband. At different times, between 1420 and 1427, we come across him again in Italy, where he had apparently preceded the king, who had embarked for Italy in July of 1420, in order to enforce his rights to the kingdom of Naples. In *La Salade* we have an interesting account of an excursion on May 18th, 1420, to the Monte della Sibilla in Umbria, not far from Spoleto, which was supposed to contain an enchanted Paradise of Queen Sibylla, the abode of delight and pleasure, forbidden to all good Christians (*ibid.*, p. 173 ff.). In the same work Antoine records his presence at Rome in 1422 (*ibid.*, p. 216), where he met the ambassadors of the King of England, among them one of his friends; having heard that he had been to the Mount of the Sibyl, they were anxious to hear what he had seen there, the more so as his friend's great-uncle, who had disappeared mysteriously, was thought to have penetrated into the grotto. We also know from *La Sale* that in the year 1425 he accompanied his sovereign on an excursion to Pozzuoli, of which he describes the solfatara and the thermal baths (*ibid.*, p. 239). In 1427 he left Italy with his king. During the latter part of 1427 and the whole of 1428, we lose all trace of Antoine de la Sale, but early in 1429 he reappears on the occasion of his taking over the post of Viguier d'Arles, to which he had just been appointed. This was a yearly office, the holder of which was the direct representative of the king in that place, and had charge of all kinds of administrative and judicial business, and was also responsible for the safety and defence of the town. During our author's term of office, the plague, then raging violently, necessitated excessive care being spent on the sanitation of the town, while elaborate precautions had also to be taken against possible attacks by the Catalans. It is improbable that de la Sale returned to Italy with Louis. In any case we find him resident in Provence in 1432, receiving further favours from his sovereign, and in the following year he appears in the rôle of intermediary between the commandant of the fortress of Vaison, besieged by the Pope's troops, and their chief, Cardinal Pierre de Foix. A document of 1436 (Dec. 16th), first published by Nève, reveals notable changes in de la Sale's life, and shows that at that date he was acting as tutor to Jean d'Anjou, Duke of Calabria and of Lorraine, eldest son of René of Anjou, Duc de Bar et de Lorraine, who in 1434 had succeeded his brother, the latter having died without leaving issue. His appointment to this post probably took place soon after the young duke was delivered from prison (Oct. 28th, 1435), where he had been kept by the Duke of Burgundy; in the document in question, King René speaks of the 'fructuosa servitia' rendered by Antoine de la Sale to 'majestati nostre ac illustri primogenito nostro,' from which it may be inferred that de la Sale had had charge of the young prince's education for some time past. He also appears as a married man in the document of 1436. It is there stated that the confirmation of the usufruct of the property of Séderon is granted to him, to his wife and to his future first-born son, 'ad suam [possessionem], sueque uxoris et futuri primogeniti ex suo corpore legitime descendentis.' Previous students, arguing partly from a passage in the *Quinze Joyes de Mariage,* which they ascribed to Antoine de la Sale, had claimed that he was a bachelor. However, in the aforesaid document, his wife is not mentioned by name; and as the phrase quoted may very well be a legal formula, the discovery by Labande of a fresh document, dated October 20th, 1439 (*loc. cit.*, p. 349), in which his wife is mentioned by name (her name was Lionne de la Sellana de Brussa), proves conclusively that he was no longer a bachelor in 1439, whatever may have been his state three years earlier. This would explain why, when he made his will in 1438, he makes no mention of a wife. The motive which impelled him to make his will was King René's expedition to Italy, in which he shared; the king, in company with his eldest son, was hastening thither to join his wife Isabella, then at Naples with their second son, in defence of his kingdom of Naples, which was threatened by Alfonso V of Aragon. King René himself took the field, and Antoine de la Sale was appointed commander of the fortress of Castel Capuano, the royal residence at Naples, the queen and royal children being left in his charge during René's absence. Whilst René was dallying in the Abruzzi, Alfonso determined to try a *coup de main* against the capital, to which he laid siege both by land and sea; but the royal tutor conducted the defence with such skill and vigour that the King of Aragon was compelled to retreat hastily. In chapter VII of his work entitled *La Sale* (Nève, *op. cit.*, 1903, p. 227), Antoine de la Sale has given a lively description of the siege, and particularly of a certain dramatic episode connected with it. A few weeks later his sovereign entered Naples in triumph and gave there a series of tournaments and festivities at which Antoine de la Sale, with the experience he possessed of such things, no doubt played an important part; and to reward his servant for his signal services, the king bequeathed to him and to his heirs in perpetuity the manor and property of Séderon, of which he had hitherto only had the gift for life. But in spite of this success, René's cause in Italy was not fated to prosper; things went from bad to worse as a result chiefly of the sudden death of the veteran Jacques Caldora, the principal mainstay of the Angevin throne in Italy, and his son's defection[1]. In order to be less hampered in his movements, King René sent back to Provence his wife and children, accompanied by Antoine de la Sale (August 4th, 1440). Our author was not to see again the classic land of Italy, which he had visited so often, and where he had gone through so many varied experiences. He was now well over fifty, and no doubt felt that the time had come to take some rest, and to give himself up freely to those literary pursuits, which henceforward became one of his chief occupations. During his sojourn in Provence he composed *La Salade*, the first of his works which have come down to us. *La Salade*, however, was not his first literary attempt. A certain Rasse de Brunhamel, the author of the romance of *Floridam et Eluide*, in the dedication of that work to Antoine de la Sale, speaks of him as having taken pleasure since his youth in writing 'histoires honnorables, ouquel exercice en continuant vous perseverez de jour en jour sans quelque interrupcion.' Moreover, he relates himself in his *Réconfort* that he once wrote a life of Jean Michel, the holy Archbishop of Angers, who had been one of the secretaries of Louis II of Anjou (Nève, *op. cit.*, 1903, p. 108). Unfortunately we know nothing of his early efforts[2]. We have very little specific information concerning Antoine de la Sale during the next few years. Probably he accompanied his pupil as before in his various journeys, though he himself mentions one episode only, after the Italian campaign, of his stay at the Angevin court; in his treatise, *Des Anciens Tournois*, we are informed that he assisted at the sumptuous festivities given by King René at Nancy in 1445, when he welcomed Charles VII in his Duchy of Lorraine (Prost, *op. cit.*, p. 216). De la Sale also notes the presence at Nancy of an English deputation, which had come over to bring back to England Margaret of Anjou, King René's daughter, affianced to Henry VI of England. He probably continued to reside for some time in Lorraine with his pupil the Duke of Calabria, who in July of the same year had been entrusted by his father with the lieutenancy of that province. Two years later, however, in the month of June, 1448, he quitted the service of René, after having served the house of Anjou for nearly half a century, and acted for a period of ten years as tutor to the young duke, who had now reached manhood. He then passed into the service of Louis de Luxembourg, Comte de Saint-Pol, to whom his wisdom and experience were well known, for they had met more than once, notably at Nancy, where the Count had been one of the chief organizers of the tournament. (Nève, *op. cit.*, 1903, p. 267.) This powerful and crafty lord, who was René's brother-in-law, and subsequently stood in the same relationship to Louis XI, had appointed him to educate his three young sons. Taking up his abode at Châtelet-sur-Oise, one of the Count's residences, the new tutor appears to have spent the next ten years there with occasional brief absences, engaged in the education of his three young charges and the composition of his remaining literary works. It is from Châtelet-sur-Oise that he dates, in 1451, *La Sale*, his second pedagogic work, which he dedicates to his master, then absent on a pilgrimage to the shrine of Saint James at Compostella. From Châtelet-sur-Oise also he sent, on March 6th, 1456, to his old pupil, John of Calabria, a copy, probably written there, of *Le Petit Jehan de Saintré.* During the same year he appears likewise to have composed his *Réconfort*, finished during a temporary stay at Vendeuil-sur-Oise, to the north-east of Châtelet-sur-Oise; while a fourth work, the aforesaid *Des Anciens Tournois*, terminated in 1459, saw the light, like the first two, at Châtelet-sur-Oise. In the course of the same year, Antoine de la Sale is known to have been at Genappe in Brabant, his presence there being attested by the dedication, in September of that year, of a manuscript of *Le Petit Jehan de Saintré.* This circumstance shows that, for some time at all events, Antoine de la Sale, along with his master, the Comte de Saint-Pol, must have formed part of the merry company which had gathered round the young Dauphin, the future Louis XI, who had taken refuge in the territory of Philippe le Bon, Duke of Burgundy. He appears indeed to have passed into the service of Philippe le Bon, for he is designated in the fiftieth story of *Les Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* as 'premier maistre d'hostel de monseigneur le duc'; and there is further evidence that in 1460 his wife occupied the position of 'cellerière' at the Burgundian court (Labande, *loc. cit.*, p. 326). In addition, Antoine de la Sale dedicated on the 1st June, 1461, from Brussels, a manuscript of his *La Sale* to the Duke of Burgundy, and hence was evidently still resident in the neighbourhood. Subsequently to that date, the last recorded date in his life, we hear nothing of him. It has been conjectured that the dispersal of the joyous company of Genappe, in August of the same year, led to the departure of Antoine de la Sale, who would then have found shelter with the family of his patron, Louis of Luxembourg. But this is pure guess-work; there is no proof or evidence of any kind that he was alive or dead, after this last recorded date; and as he was at least 73 in 1461, and perhaps as much as 75, the probability is that he must have died either in 1461, or very soon after.

---

[1] Legrand d'Aussy (*loc. cit.* p. 392), misled by MSS. of later date, had placed the date of Antoine's birth in 1398. His mistake has been reproduced by Wright (*op. cit.*, p. xv), by Stern (*loc. cit.*, p. 117), by Prost (*op. cit.*, p. xv), by Petit de Julleville (*op. cit.*, p. 394, and *loc. cit.*, p. 217), and by G. Hellény (*op. cit.*, p. XIV). Before Gossart's researches it was generally believed that he was born in Burgundy. This belief is based on the following passage of *Les Mémoires historiques de la république séquanoise des princes de Franche-Comté et de Bourgogne* of Louis Gollut, himself a Franc-Comtois by origin: 'Ces rois d'armes et tous ceux des Gaules estoient nommés rois d'armes Poyers, à la différence de ceux de l'Empire, qui estoient appellés Royers, comme Antoine de la Sale, de nostre pays, hat escript, avec plusieurs choses concernantes la noblesse et le faict des héraux et rois d'armes' (ed. 1592, p. 890). This error also is reproduced by Prost, Petit de Julleville, and Hellény. Wright says he was born either in Burgundy or Touraine.

[2] 'Faut-il ajouter,' says Labande (*loc. cit.*, p. 61), 'qu'on ne peut avoir trop grande confiance dans les dates données par Antoine dans ses œuvres et qu'il paraît dans l'occurrence s'être quelque peu rajeuni? Son père avait quitté Avignon et la Provence en août. Pérrinette Damendel, qui resta dans le pays comme tout le fait supposer, ne fut mère au plus tard que dans les cinq premiers mois de 1387. A la rigueur donc, Antoine de la Sale pourrait être né en 1387, mais il est bien plus probable qu'il naquit en 1386. Lorsque plus tard il écrivit son livre, il se serait trompé environ de deux ans sur son âge.'

---

[1] See Lecoy de la Marche, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 179—185.

[2] Three of the manuscripts of *Saintré* contain an *Addition extraite des Chroniques de Flandres*, which is merely a compilation. In one of these MSS. (no. 10057 of the Bibliothèque Nationale) Antoine de la Sale declares, in the dedication to Jean d'Anjou, that the second volume of his work 'traictera des tresloyalles amours de mademoiselle Vyenne d'Allençon et de Paris de Roussillon, comme les plus martirs d'amours que j'aye leu ne oy dire, auquel je besongne tant comme je puis, pour obeir à vos dictes prieres.' We are not aware that Antoine ever carried out his intention; if he had, his romance of Paris and Vyenne would probably have been a *rifacimento* of an old theme, which, it may be mentioned, another Provençal of the name of La Sippade had already treated and given out as translated from Catalan (cf. G. Paris, *Esquisse*, p. 249).

Such is the life, sketched in outline, of one who could claim at the end of his career that, whatever were his achievements, he had indeed lived no monotonous existence. As soldier, official, tutor to princes, man of letters, and traveller in his own and in foreign countries, his opportunities of studying life and its vicissitudes had been, not only varied, but such as rarely fall within the experience of the ordinary mortal. The various masters he had served were as different in character as they were numerous, and their chequered fortune was well calculated to stir the inquiring spirit and imagination of one who had been their friend and trusted counsellor. His repeated visits to Italy also brought him into contact with a new conception of life and art, while later in life, during his sojourn in the North, he probably witnessed the early efflorescence of Flemish art in the persons of the brothers van Eyck and Roger van der Weyde. How far Antoine de la Sale profited from this rich store of experience and the many opportunities it afforded for the acquirement of knowledge, we shall have occasion to enquire ultimately. Was he to the end of his career a man of the Middle Ages, unable to liberate himself from the early impressions received at the court of his first master, the last incarnation of the ideal mediæval knight, or are we to look upon him as the representative of the new spirit and of the new ideals in literature? Or again, is it possible that the truth lies half way; and that Antoine de la Sale, Janus-like, is a man with two faces, one turned towards mediæval tradition, and the other peering enquiringly towards the New Light?

A. The Authentic Works.

The following is a list, arranged in chronological order, of Antoine de la Sale's authentic works, to each of which is added a brief descriptive and critical account, indispensable for the investigation of the thorny problem which forms the subject of enquiry.

I. *La Salade* (completed after Nov. 14th, 1442). No modern edition. The part concerning the Paradise of Queen Sibylla has been printed by W. Söderhjelm in *Mémoires de la Société Néo-philologique à Helsingfors*, II, 1897, p. 101 ff., and by Nève (*op. cit.*, 1903, pp. 173—222), as well as the pages which describe the excursion to the Lipari Islands. For black-letter editions see Brunet, *Manuel du Libraire*, III, p. 854.

The only complete manuscript is the one in the Bibliothèque Royale de Bruxelles[1] (No. 18210). There is also a fragmentary manuscript, containing the Paradise of Queen Sibylla and the geographical chapters, in the Musée Condé at Chantilly, dedicated to the Duchesse de Bourbon, Agnes of Burgundy, sister of Philip the Good, wife of Charles de Bourbon, Count of Clairmont.

The date of *La Salade*, which is dedicated to Jean de Calabre and to his consort Marie de Bourbon, whose marriage took place on April 2nd, 1437, has been calculated to fall in the interval between 1437 and 1442, when King René was finally dispossessed of the kingdom of Naples, the latter date representing the *terminus ad quem*, on the ground that Antoine de la Sale would hardly have included an epitome of the history of Sicily and a genealogy of the House of Anjou after René had lost his possessions in Italy. This is correct so far as it goes; but Labande (*loc. cit.*, p. 95) has attained greater precision by drawing attention to a passage of *La Salade* in which Yolande of Aragon, Queen of Naples, is spoken of as 'de glorieuse mémoire,' proving thereby that *La Salade* could have been completed only after the 14th of November, 1442, the date of the death of Yolande of Aragon.

True to the title of the work, which, apart from the fact that it contains a pun on the author's name, is so chosen 'pour ce que en la salade se mettent plusieurs bonnes herbes,' Antoine de la Sale's first production is completely lacking in coherence and originality. It is little more than a medley of matters which he considered useful for the education of his pupil. It opens with a series of short chapters on the art of government and on the qualities which a future ruler should strive to acquire—a dull and heavy piece of work, only relieved in the third chapter by an incident concerning Boucicaut, which shows incidentally that de la Sale was capable of reproducing when he chose the tone of familiar conversation, though it should be noted in passing that this anecdote is not found in the manuscripts, but only in the printed versions. This first part of *La Salade* is followed by a list (borrowed by de la Sale, and repeated in some of his other works) of the ancient authors which the tutor advises his pupils to read—Livy, Orosius, Suetonius, Sallust, Lucan, Polybius, etc.,—practically the same course of reading drawn up by the Dame des Belles Cousines for the use of Petit Jehan de Saintré. Next follow, for the benefit of the future politician and warrior, some historical examples, culled principally from Valerius Maximus and from Frontinus, not however directly from these authors, but from the translation of Valerius Maximus by one Simon de Hesdin, to which we shall recur. Anxious, no doubt, to alleviate the monotony of the narrative, de la Sale then inserts, rather unexpectedly, 'pour rire et passer le temps,' the account (folios 31—37) of his visit to the mountain grotto of Queen Sibylla, and the details which he had gathered on the spot concerning the enchantress and her abode of everlasting pleasure, and those who had been allured there; more particularly what befel a certain German knight and his squire, who, after succeeding in tearing themselves away from the bewitched grotto, determined nevertheless to return, and were never heard of again. De la Sale relates his visit if not with conciseness, at least with remarkable precision, and is careful to emphasize the fact that he did not penetrate further than the antechamber of the grotto, on the walls of which he inscribed his motto and name: '*Il conuient. De La Sale.*' As to the interior of the grotto, and what happened to those who had penetrated there, the reader must be satisfied with the second-hand information de la Sale collected from the natives, which forms an interesting chapter in the history of a legend then implicitly believed in, and perpetuated in the story of Tannhäuser. The author also finds room at this point for a graphic account of his visit in 1406 to the Lipari Islands and his ascent of Stromboli. The next three folios are occupied with a description, much expanded in the printed versions, of the three parts of the world, including the purgatory of Saint Patrick. He also includes, as we have already noted, an abridged chronicle of the House of Sicily, and a genealogy of the House of Aragon, and concludes with a chapter devoted to details of heraldry, an art for which he had a great predilection, and on which he was a great authority.

---

[1] For further details concerning the Brussels MS., see Gossart, *op. cit.*, p. 80, and Söderhjelm, *Notes*, p. 34 ff.

II. *La Sale* (1451). No modern edition, though Grojean, according to Nève (*op. cit.*, 1903, p. 53), is said to be preparing an edition. Extracts will be found in Nève (*op. cit.*, 1903, pp. 226—245). There are two manuscripts, both in the Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique (Gossart, *loc. cit.*, p. 80). Of these, the one numbered 10959 is probably the original manuscript offered by de la Sale to Louis of Luxembourg. At the end of the manuscript we read the following words: '*Acheue et parfait en uostre chastel de Chastellez, le xx^e jour du mois d'octobre, l'an de Nostre Seigneur, mil. cccc cinquante et ung.*'

La Sale is also a moral and didactic work, totally lacking in originality, even more so than *La Salade*, and composed mainly of extracts from ancient authors, loosely strung together. At times the dreary narrative is illuminated by personal observations and reflections, prompted by the events reviewed, but such passages are too few and far between to relieve appreciably the general monotony[1]. In the Prologue the author himself defines his treatise as 'trait de plusieurs sains docteurs et aultres ystoriographes, desquelz j'ay aulcun peu requelly de leurs sentences, rapportant à memoire les tres glorieux examples de nos peres anciens, qui assez plus amarent leurs honneurs et la chose publique que ne firent leurs vyes.' This avowal, however, only gives a faint idea of de la Sale's plagiarism; it has been proved recently by Marcel Lecourt that approximately nine-tenths of *La Sale* is copied, with varying degrees of servility, from a French translation of the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* of Valerius Maximus by the aforesaid Simon de Hesdin, of the Order of the Hospitallers of Saint John of Jerusalem. Hesdin wrote, between 1375—85, in honour of King Charles V, a translation of the work of Valerius Maximus, accompanied by a full and varied commentary, from which Antoine de la Sale lifted whole passages as well as from the translation proper; so that, though his prefatory remark is in a sense true, the 'holy doctors and other historiographers' from whom he acknowledges borrowings are those mentioned in Hesdin's translation of Valerius Maximus, and include Simon de Hesdin himself. Among these enforced loans is included the chapter on marriage and on the advantages of celibacy from Saint Jerome, on which we shall have to insist in due course, and which had been adduced in support of de la Sale's authorship of the *Quinze Joyes de Mariage*, before Lecourt's discovery.

---

[1] Many of the personal reflections, from which rather hasty conclusions have been drawn as to de la Sale's character and opinions, are not his own. They are frequently borrowed *en bloc* from Hesdin. See on that point Lecourt's remarks (*loc. cit.*, p. 346), who shows, *inter alia*, that the curious passage in *La Sale*, in which the priests of his time are assailed for their slackness and cupidity, is conveyed straight from Hesdin's commentary.

The author, once again punning on his name[1], proceeds in this allegory after the fashion of an architect; the foundations of the edifice are Prudence, Devotion and Moderation; Justice, Piety and Humanity compose the walls, while other virtues are pictured as representing the windows, doors, pavements, etc. Excepting the passage on marriage, which is not original, and a few others describing personal experiences—such as the story of the death of the Infante Pedro of Castille under the walls of the fortress of Capuano, or the account of the devotion of the wife of the barber of Arles—Antoine de la Sale's style and presentation shew little improvement on his first effort, and leave us unprepared for the great advance he was to make in his next attempt, *Le Petit Jehan de Saintré*, the most notable of his authentic works.

III. *Le Petit Jehan de Saintré.* Ed. Gueulette, 1724; ed. Lami-Denozan, in black-letter, Paris, 1830; ed. M. Guichart, Paris, 1843; ed. G. Hellény, Paris, 1890, merely a copy of Guichart's edition. For the manuscripts, nine in number, see G. Raynaud, *Romania*, XXXI (1902), pp. 538–543, and *ibid.*, pp. 543–4, for black-letter and for modern editions.

In the MS. nouv. acq. fr. 10057 in the Bibliothèque Nationale the Lettre d'Envoi addressed to Jean d'Anjou, Duke of Calabria, concludes with the words: 'Escript au Chasteller-sur-Oize, le VI^e jour de mars, l'an de Nostre Seigneur, mil quatre cens cinquante et cinq,' i.e., 1456, according to the New Style. G. Raynaud (*Romania*, XXXI, p. 533) was the first to draw attention in 1902 to this important date, and he inclines to believe that *Saintré* was probably written at an even earlier period. It was previously believed that 1459, the date borne by MS. 1506 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, represented the date of composition—in fact, 1459 is still put down as the date of composition of *Saintré* by some scholars, in spite of Raynaud's correction.

The story of *Le Petit Jehan de Saintré* is somewhat as follows:

At the court of the good King John of France, eldest son of King Philip of Valois, lived a 'tres debonnaire et gracieulz juvencel,' named John, eldest son of the Lord of Saintré. Because of his graciousness and manly appearance, John is appointed page by the king. At the same court lived also a young widow whom the author calls 'Madame des Belles Cousines,' but who is not otherwise designated, we are told, on account of what happens in the course of the story. The lady, faithful to the memory of her departed husband, has sworn, following the example of the ancient Roman widows, never to marry again, and determines to devote her time and energy to the education of any young and worthy page whom she may find in the court. She selects for her purpose Petit Jehan, who is then only twelve years of age, and of whom she is very fond. She speaks to him as to a child, to the amusement of her friends; and as the first requisite of a perfect knight is to have a lady-love, she asks him jokingly who his sweetheart may be. The abashed youth, not knowing what to say, replies artlessly that he loves his mother and sister best; but the lady brushes aside his childish reply as irrelevant and reminds him of the great chivalrous prototypes of King Arthur's Round Table—Lancelot, Gawain, Tristan etc., who all served a Lady. Finally, the page, to the delight of his questioner, who, as de la Sale tells us, was only jesting, names Matheline de Courcy, a ten year old damsel, as the lady of his heart. Milady, however, has been playing with fire; at first she sought the young page's company in order to laugh at him with her companions, but after some time she sees him alone and treats him quite differently from the others. She appoints herself as his preceptress; teaches him the rules of courtly love, and enumerates for his benefit the seven deadly sins of which the amorous knight should beware, and the virtues he must cultivate. In order that precept should chime with theory, she cleverly contrives matters in such a way that she proclaims herself his Lady. She knows that fine feathers make fine birds, so she gives her young pupil a sum of money that he may equip himself suitably. When John is turned sixteen, she duly obtains for him the position of carver at the king's table. Now that he is growing older double caution is necessary. Accordingly, when she wishes to see him secretly, she arranges a code of signals; if Milady picks her teeth, it is a sign that she wishes to see the young knight alone, and he, following her instructions, answers affirmatively by rubbing his right eye. The pair arrange to meet in her garden, of which the knight is given the key; but in the midst of their kisses and amorous sport, the lady does not forget her intention of helping him to a glorious career. She gives him more money to buy his own horse. His education is continued and completed by means of a course in the literature and history of the Middle Ages and Antiquity, for which Saintré is recommended to read certain authors which Antoine de la Sale had already tabulated in his first work. Now that the youth's career as a knight is about to begin, his preceptress solemnly performs the initiation by placing on his hand, on the first of May, a bracelet, which he must wear for a year and defend against every attacker of knightly rank. To celebrate the occasion, a court banquet is held, and the young knight takes a vow, as was usual in the Middle Ages, in the presence of the peacock[1], the crown of all food just as woman is the crown of all creation. Petit Jehan acquits himself of his vow by fighting with a knight of Aragon at Barcelona, where the King-at-Arms has made the necessary preparations for the contest. Young Saintré is victorious both in the combat on horseback, for he is the first to break five lances, whereas his opponent breaks only four, and in the duel on foot, fought in iron armour and with battle-axes. After this exploit he continues his victorious career at home by defeating a famous Polish knight, the Lord of Loisselench, who was so famous for his strength and prowess that Milady nearly breaks her heart for having encouraged her young lover to meet so redoubtable a foe. Some months pass in idleness, but the young widow soon reminds Saintré that it behoves him to be stirring. In response to her appeal he defeats certain English knights, and finally, with his friend Boucicaut, he proves the superiority of French arms to two Italian champions. Then Milady concludes that it is time to end his career as a jouster, and as, soon after, Petit Jehan's father dies and the young page suddenly blossoms out into the noble Lord of Saintré, she sends him, in order that he may finish his military career, on an expedition against the Saracens in Prussia[2], to the description of which Antoine de la Sale, pursuing his task with evident relish, devotes some seventy pages to enumerate the participators, their weapons and their war-cries. This part of the work (the didactic purpose is manifest) was intended to be a kind of little Gotha Almanach, which, if diligently read, led to a knowledge of the important French families of the time. The Crusaders journey eastwards as far as the town of Torrin (probably Thorn), and here they meet Crusaders from other lands—English princes, German lords, who are likewise enumerated and described in great detail. The Saracens, whose host is represented as 'la plus grande armée que depuis la loy de Mahommet ils eussent faicte,' are depicted in a quite fantastic manner, in the style of the late National Epic, which never distinguishes between heathen and heathen, and invariably represents Slavs, Mahomedans, Persians, Babylonians and Carthaginians as confederates. The heathen chief is Abazin, 'le grand Turc de Prusse,' his lieutenants are Zizach, who styles himself Emperor of Carthage; Alemoch, Sultan of Babylon; Arachul, Sultan of Mabaloth, and various other potentates with imaginary names. A decisive battle takes place on the plain of Bellehoch (perhaps Bialystock in Poland), and the heathens are of course brilliantly defeated; Saintré, being the hero of the tale, naturally plays the *beau rôle* and slays the 'great Turk' with his own hand, and the Crusaders return homeward.

---

[1] He says in the prologue: 'le livre qui s'ensuit, lequel je nomme *la Sale*, dont je porte le surnom.'

---

[1] This custom of taking an oath in the presence of a noble bird—whether peacock, pheasant or heron mattered little—was much in vogue at the Burgundian court. One need only recall the sumptuous Banquet du Faisan (Doutrepont, *op. cit.*, 1908, p. 106) offered by Philip of Burgundy to the Burgundian nobility at his palace of Rihour, at Lille, on Feb. 17th, 1454, during which all the assembled knights, including Philip, took a solemn oath to take up the cross and fight the infidels.

[2] De la Sale is probably alluding to Philip of Burgundy's projected crusade against the Turks, which he never carried out, but which seems to have haunted him during his whole reign. Cf. Pirenne, *Histoire de la Belgique*, II (1908), p. 252–4, and Doutrepont, *op. cit.*, 1908, p. 236.

We now enter on what may be named the second part of the romance, which, compared with the part summarised, is pitched in quite a different key. Petit Jehan's education is now complete. The didactic element falls out, and Antoine de la Sale writes with a broad pen a realistic tale which has not its equal in French literature till the advent of Rabelais.

On Saintré's return home, the king wants to know on the first day all the news; but the knight puts off his sovereign by telling him that he is anxious to wait upon Milady, and he begs the king, not in his former modest tone, but laughingly, to keep his queen company that evening as a welcome to him. The king jokes at the gallant knight, always on the side of the ladies, and grants the request; but the queen, for even queens are women, would fain know the reason for this request, and Jehan, no longer Petit Jehan, be it noted, explains by saying that he has not left the saddle for six weeks and would like a rest. This is only a pretext to enable Saintré and his lady-love to meet at their old rendez-vous, where 'furent les baisers donnés et baisers rendus, tant qu'ilz ne s'en povoient saouller, et demandes et reponses telles qu'amours vouloient et commandoient.' This blissful state is described as lasting fifteen months. However a difficulty was to arise, springing from the difference between the disposition of man and woman. Our hero, tired of this endless love-making, and fired anew with the love of adventure, foregoing for the first time Milady's counsel or permission, resolves to sally forth to new deeds with five companions of the same mind. He tells her of his purpose, but only when the whole matter is arranged. She rages on hearing of her lover's caprice, and requests him to break his promise and desist from his enterprise, but he points out that such a course is impossible. As he refuses to yield, she is compelled to acquiesce, which she does reluctantly, after moodily tying his colours on his shoulder. The young widow is obviously much mortified at this sudden and unexpected show of independence on the part of one who had hitherto been her humble and obedient lover. From the moment he has departed, she loses colour, grows thin, refuses food and is unable to sleep, till the queen, struck by her appearance, calls in the Court doctor, whose finding is that she is sound in body but sick at heart. Milady bribes the doctor to assert that she requires a change of air, and that she is pining away because she has not seen her home for sixteen years; and the queen thereupon allows her leave for two months to go to her estate and castle in the country, whither she retires. The menials and monks of the Castle-abbey receive their mistress heartily, none more so than the young abbot, who detains her and her companions to lunch, for which he has made due preliminary preparations by the simple artifice of putting on the clock an hour and a half. It soon becomes apparent that Milady is smitten by the abbot's charms, and that the attraction is reciprocal. She chooses the 'damp abez' as her father confessor in order more readily to indulge her wicked commerce with him, and what with hunting and amusements, she forgets Saintré so completely that she overstays her leave. . Meanwhile the six knights, successful in their tournament at Cologne, have returned, and Saintré, not finding Milady at Court, hastens to her castle and finds her hawking with the abbot and suite. He comes up with them, but is met with an unexpected 'Ha! sire, le très mal venu soyez vous'! Saintré, who has not heard Milady's insolent apostrophe, kneels down before her and kisses her hand. However he is not long in perceiving that the abbot has displaced him in the lady's affections, but nevertheless he accepts from his rival an invitation to dinner. After the meal the abbot, encouraged by the jeering approbation of the Dame des Belles Cousines and the lively play under the table of her feet against his, lets himself go in an invective against the trustworthiness of knights' tales and their exploits, to the delight of Milady, who spurs him on by word and deed. Saintré naturally champions the cause of his order and declares that anyone who insults knighthood will have to deal with him, whereupon the monk springs to his feet and challenges Saintré to a wrestling match. Although the knight is quite unaccustomed to this plebeian mode of fighting, he is forced to agree to escape the taunt of cowardice which Milady launches at him. The combatants enter on the contest, and Saintré is defeated twice, to the delight of the abbot's paramour and her ladies. But Saintré broods revenge, and procures two suits of knightly armour. Pursuing his scheme, he invites the party to dinner, and during the meal takes occasion to praise the abbot's figure, averring that the ecclesiastic would look splendid in armour. The vain monk falls into the trap, and dons a coat of armour, which, he declares, he fully deserves because of his performance in the wrestling match. Thereupon Saintré, in a terrible voice, cries out that he has not yet deserved the armour, and challenges his rival to a duel—in *his* style. The abbot protests vigorously that he cannot fight in that way, but Saintré answers frigidly that there is no escape from the contest—except through the window. Milady tries in vain to exercise her old influence over the knight and commands him to desist, but he angrily upbraids her for her infidelity, and in a moment of forgetfulness almost strikes her. Then he orders two axes and two daggers to be brought forth; the combat takes place, and ends in the complete discomfiture of the abbot. Saintré is about to dispatch his enemy; but at the last moment certain texts which enjoin clemency cross his mind and he contents himself with piercing the abbot's tongue and cheeks with his dagger. Then he turns scornfully towards the one he had served so loyally. 'Adieu, dame la plus fauce qui oncques fut!,' he exclaims, and snatches from her her blue girdle, for blue signifies loyalty. He then departs and leaves Milady, who, though momentarily overcome by sorrow and shame, vows vengeance. She is bidden by the queen to return to Court, which she does reluctantly. On a certain evening, as the Court is assembled, Saintré invites the company to listen to a 'vraye nouvelle et merveilleuse histoire' of which he knows, and he proceeds to unfold the whole story, but without mentioning names. His tale finished, he bids the ladies of the Court pass judgment on the woman's behaviour. From the queen downward, all vehemently brand the wickedness and disloyalty of the lady who has betrayed her faithful lover. Then he turns towards the Dame des Belles Cousines to ask *her* opinion. She replies evasively by blaming the knight for tearing away the lady's blue girdle. Thereupon Saintré coolly hands back to her her girdle, thus revealing to the assembled Court the characters of the story and the lady's unworthy part.

The first part of *Petit Jehan de Saintré* which itself falls into two divisions (the opening didactic chapters, and the following chapters dedicated to the description of tourneys and the Prussian crusade), although it contains many charming pictures and occasional hints of what is to come, is on the whole, particularly in the second section, a prolix, tedious story, containing a great deal of matter (at least half of the whole work) which may have been of interest to the author's contemporaries, but which leaves us cold, and is, moreover, quite irrelevant to the intrigue. On the other hand, the second part of the work, describing the amours of the Dame des Belles Cousines and the coarse and sensual monk, is a masterly composition, instinct with keen psychological insight and vividly realistic scenes. This disparity, it must be admitted, is a blemish on an otherwise great work, and is so striking to the modern reader, accustomed to more finished art, that some critics of eminence have been unable to see any connection between the earlier and concluding chapters. Gossart, for example, who was under the impression that the contrast between the two parts could be explained by the assumption (which has since been proved to be unfounded) that Antoine de la Sale had completed his romance at Genappe, under the influence of the merry company that had accompanied the future Louis XI there, expresses his opinion in no uncertain fashion: 'Dans la première [partie] Saintré nous offre le modèle du chevalier accompli, l'idéal de l'amour pur et désintéressé. Guidé dès l'enfance par une dame vertueuse qui l'aime d'un amour pur, il est l'idole de la cour et il s'élève par ses prouesses au rang des plus fameux héros. Mais tout à coup, sans préparation, sans motif, l'auteur prend comme un malin plaisir à détruire tout ce bel édifice de chastes propos et d'incidents chevaleresques. La dame vertueuse oublie son élève et son amant pour un moine dont la figure grotesque et la sensualité contrastent singulièrement avec le portrait du Petit Saintré. La charmante institutrice du chevalier sans égal n'est plus qu'une femme vulgaire qui s'abandonne sans retenue à une passion aussi déréglée qu'inexplicable...... C'est ainsi que le roman commencé pour l'instruction du duc de Calabre, le fils du chevaleresque René, se termine comme un conte fait pour égayer Louis XI.' This, we think, is a superficial view, prompted by a perfunctory examination of de la Sale's romance. The first two books (there is no such division on the author's part) describe the career of the ideal knight, according to the fashion of the time, after the manner of other stories of the same type, such as the *Chronique du Loyal Serviteur* (Bayard), *Le Livre des Faits de Jacques de Lalaing*, another famous knight, and *Le Livre des Faits de Jean Boucicaut*. Antoine de la Sale also takes an historical character as his subject in the person of one Jehan de Saintré, about whom we have little information, except that he is known to have fought against the English in the year 1350–1, and to have been taken prisoner at the battle of Poitiers. If then our author in 1456 decided to write his romance on a character of the past century, it is not improbable (especially in the light of his pronounced fondness for other people's goods) that he borrowed, not only the name but also the deeds, in part at all events, of his hero, from some written source. No such source, however, has so far been discovered. G. Raynaud has indeed pointed out undoubted resemblances as regards certain incidents between the *Petit Jehan de Saintré* and *Le Livre des Faits de Jacques de Lalaing*[1], from which he infers that Antoine de la Sale was probably the author of both works. His conclusions, however, have not been generally accepted. Antoine de la Sale also borrowed certain incidents—this also has been proved by Raynaud—from the *Livre des Faits de Boucicaut*[2], who was a contemporary of Saintré and was taken prisoner with him at Poitiers. Saintré, like Boucicaut, visits the Emperor of Constantinople and proceeds to Cairo; in the same way as Boucicaut he goes on a crusade to Prussia with numerous knights who had formed part of the expedition to Hungary in 1396; and as Antoine de la Sale mentions Boucicaut by name, it is certain that he knew of the book celebrating that knight's exploits.

Thus the first two books of *Le Petit Jehan de Saintré* offer no riddle or difficulty, and differ very little from similar contemporary productions. But the concluding chapters, in which the amours of the Dame des Belles Cousines and her profligate companion are depicted, are pitched in a key so different that the sudden change is by no means easy to explain. G. Raynaud (*Romania*, XXXI, 1902, pp. 555–6) has advanced the explanation, tentatively it is true, that in this portion of the romance Antoine de la Sale wished to write a satire on the love of Charles VII for the beautiful and fascinating Agnes Sorel, who had died in 1453, a butt to her dying day for the attacks of the writers of the Burgundian Court. If that is so, de la Sale would have had a living subject for his text, which would account, as it does in the *Réconfort* and in the few passages of *La Salade* and *La Sale* which are based on personal experience, for the spirit and dramatic touch which we look for in vain in the two other parts of *Saintré* and in his authentic works generally. May it not be that the solution is much simpler; that Antoine de la Sale, after writing the first part of his work in the fashion of his time, desired to show what he was capable of independently? However that may be, the gulf between the conduct of the lady in the first part and the characteristics she displays subsequently is not so great as some critics have maintained, though it must be admitted that her earlier actions hardly lead one to expect so sudden and complete a change of front. We get more than one glimpse of her malice and sensuality at an early stage, as

---

[1] Published in the first instance by Kervyn de Lettenhove in *Œuvres de Georges Chastellain*, t. VIII, 1886, pp. 1—259

[2] Published by Buchon at the end of his edition of Froissart, t. III, pp. 567–95.

G. Paris aptly points out[1]; and later on when the young knight takes a decision of his own accord without consulting his imperious mistress, the author is careful to underline the psychological effect produced on the selfish woman, hitherto accustomed to command and unable to grasp the point of new undertakings on the part of her lover, once the goal has been reached. Her fondness for Saintré rested on his docility and compliance, a point on which Antoine de la Sale insists throughout; the first independent action on his part was bound to shake her affection to the very foundations. The rupture is there from that moment, though only latent; Milady flees from the Court which has brought her disillusion and is now desolate for her; her selfish and spiteful nature drives her to seek consolation in the dissolute abbot's arms. Then only is it that the woman's real self is revealed. A modern writer would no doubt have introduced at this point the mingling of the erotic and the religious; but what appealed to a writer of that time was the coarse covetousness of the monk and the traditional weakness of woman in the presence of the priestly garb, which, being a common-place in those days, Antoine de la Sale does not attempt to explain psychologically. Despite this lapse, the evolution of character rests in no wise on an inartistic use of chance, but on the inner growth of things and persons, which is equivalent to saying that the development and reciprocal influence of the characters are founded on a psychological basis. No less remarkable is Antoine de la Sale's realism, even in the long descriptions of the first two books, frequently wearisome in their faithfulness and detail, but important as historical documents. Nowhere are the limits of probability overstepped, except perhaps in the description of the infidels; the hero is a deft swordsman, but never accomplishes impossible feats, as in the *chansons de geste*—in fact an ordinary monk who has learnt the technique of wrestling hurls him to the ground, twice, without much difficulty. The Knight without Fear or Reproach beaten by a Capuchin monk! *That* is realism! But after all it is only natural for a practised wrestler, though an ecclesiastic, to defeat the knight who is the flower of chivalry, if the knight has not learnt the art. We must not therefore look for any satiric intention in this episode; Saintré, fighting with his own weapons, is given full opportunity to wipe out the disgrace completely; and in the end he can relate his own overthrow in the presence of the whole Court without incurring the slightest blame or reproach. Thus, in spite of certain reservations which suggest themselves naturally, and of which the most serious is the slender thread between the first and second part of the story, it is no exaggeration to say that *Le Petit Jehan de Saintré* is the first in point of date of the long series of realistic novels for which French literature is so famous, and not the least remarkable in that brilliant galaxy.

---

[1] *Esquisse Historique de la Littérature Française au Moyen Age*, Paris, 1907, p. 248.

IV. *Le Réconfort de Madame de Fresne* (1457 ?). Ed. Nève (*op. cit.*, 1881, and *op. cit.*, 1903). There is only one manuscript, no. 10748 of the Bibliothèque Royal de Belgique. It is signed by Antoine de la Sale, and closes with the words: '*Escript à Vendueil sur Oise le xiiij*^{e} *jour de dessembre, l'an mil quattre cens et cincquante et...*' The lady to whom *Le Réconfort* is addressed was married in October, 1456, to Jacques de Lille, Seigneur de Fresne et de Gueulesin. In January, 1459, la Sale was back at Châtelet, where he dated his *Des Anciens Tournois*. At the end of the same year he was at Genappe, from which place he signed the dedication of a copy of *Saintré*. Comparing these dates, we may put down the composition of the *Réconfort* as falling between 1457 and 1459, with a presumption in favour of 1458. G. Raynaud, however (*Romania*, XXXIV, 1905, p. 319), claims to have seen a manuscript, of which he does not know the fate, dated from Vendueil-sur-Oise, 16th December, 1457.

Antoine de la Sale's object in writing the *Réconfort* was to console the Lady de Fresne for the death of her infant and only son. In order to enable her the better to endure her burden, he unfolds before her eyes, as an object lesson, the still harsher fate of two other mothers who had also lost their only sons, and shows how each of them bore the heavy blow with courage and resignation. The *Réconfort*, setting aside some preliminary matter of no importance, consists of two narratives or 'examples.' The first, in which de la Sale plays fast and loose with historical facts in order to drive home his moral more effectively, represents le Sire du Chastel, the King's representative, as besieged in the castle of Brest by the Black Prince. The Sire du Chastel, who is at the end of his resources but hopes for help, concludes a truce with the Black Prince, at the expiration of which it is stipulated that he must surrender the place if he has not obtained the expected assistance. In order to ensure the fulfilment of the contract, du Chastel's only son, aged thirteen, is given up as a hostage to the Black Prince. The truce is about to expire when du Chastel receives the expected relief in the shape of a cargo of provisions. But the Black Prince, false to his word, refuses to give up his hostage, and sends word that he will have him put to the sword unless the fortress capitulates immediately. The unfortunate father, torn between his high sense of duty and love for his only son, turns to his wife for help in his affliction. After a terrible struggle the Lady du Chastel, seeing her husband's desperate position, declares that she is resigned to face the sacrifice of her son's life rather than that her husband should lose his honour by surrendering the fortress. The second narrative, which is strictly historical and took place during the crusade against the Moroccans in which de la Sale himself participated, relates how a Portuguese knight of the name of Vasco Fernandez de Tayde, seeing the Infante Dom Pedro of Portugal assailed on all sides by the Moors, rushes to his assistance, and sacrifices his life to save that of his master. On the return of the expedition to Portugal, the Court, including the gallant knight's mother, assembles to congratulate the King and his warriors on their victory over the infidels. But the anxious mother sees no sign of her son; a terrible presentiment comes over her, and when she learns from the king's lips that the gallant knight has perished, she falls to the ground in a swoon. She gradually comes to herself, and in spite of her great grief consoles herself with the thought that her brave son laid down his life for his master's sake.

Next to *Saintré*, with which it can hardly enter into comparison on account of its restricted scope, the *Réconfort* is undoubtedly the best of Antoine de la Sale's authentic works, particularly the first part, which deals with the incident of the siege of Brest. Though the style is still occasionally somewhat sluggish and tangled, the dramatic and pathetic note, as well as the psychological insight displayed by the author, give these two 'histoires tragiques' a modern touch hitherto unknown in French prose.

V. *Des Anciens Tournois et Faictz d'Armes* (1459). Ed. Bernard Prost, Paris, 1872, in his *Traités du duel judiciaire, Relations de Pas d'Armes et Tournois*, pp. 193—221. There are two manuscripts, both in the Bibliothèque Nationale (nos. 5867 and 1997). The second MS., unknown to Prost, was first indicated by Söderhjelm (*Notes*, p. 112). MS. 5867 is signed by Antoine de la Sale, and concludes with the following words, which give the date of the work: '*Escript et achiefvé au Chasteller sur Oize, le quatrisme jour de janvier de l'an mil quatre cens cincquante et huit*'—or 1459, New Style.

This treatise was composed by de la Sale at the request of Jacques de Luxembourg, Seigneur de Riquebourg, son of Pierre, Count of Brienne and Saint-Pol, his former pupil, and of Marguerite de Baux d'Andrie. It is mainly devoted to technical information concerning tournaments, and to detailed descriptions of crests and coats of arms. In between are inserted at intervals interesting passages referring to personal experiences, valuable for the author's biography, and useful as indications of his character. Antoine de la Sale, who represents himself as 'viel et non savant,' contrasts, as he does elsewhere also, the present unfavourably with the good old times, when tournaments and the heraldic arts were in their heyday. 'Au bon temps de jadiz,' he exclaims with ill-disguised regret, 'les salles, les chambres, et les hostelz des nobles hommes estoient paintes on tappisées de belles ystoires, des illustres batailles et conquestes des vaillans, ou des blasons aux nobles du royaume, à mémoire de chascum estre bon. Et ores ne sont paintes que de chasses et volleries, de pastoureaulx et de brebis, ou d'amoureux déduitz, et tous au préjudice de nos ames, et, plusieurs foiz, de noz honneurs et de noz vies.' In the same spirit he recalls with manifest delight the tournaments of Brussels and Ghent in which he took part, either as an actor or witness, more than fifty years previously. Lastly, attention may be drawn to a certain passage which appears to show that Antoine de la Sale had at some time visited England: 'Et ceste coustume de blasonner ay veu que aucunement se entretenoit par aucuns seigneurs et nobles, et par aucunes dames et damoiselles en Engleterre, qui sont les plus sérémonieuses gens en honneurs que je aye gaires veu.' From this declaration it may perhaps not be too rash to conjecture that Antoine de la Sale was one of the escort that accompanied Margaret of Anjou to England on her marriage to the English king.

Taken as a whole, this short treatise has very little literary value, and adds nothing to the author's reputation as a writer, however much renown it may have won for him among his contemporaries as a specialist in heraldic lore.

VI. *La Journée d'Onneur et de Prouesse* (1459). Ed. Nève (*op. cit.*, 1881, pp. 45—63). Preserved in the same manuscripts as the *Réconfort*, immediately following that treatise. This composition of some five hundred octosyllabic lines is a frigid and tedious allegory of the usual type so common in those days, and proves clearly that Antoine de la Sale was not endowed with the poetic gift. Together with the few doggerel lines interspersed in his prose works, it constitutes his only attempt in verse.

(*To be continued*)

L. E. KASTNER.

MANCHESTER.

GIL VICENTE'S 'AUTO DA ALMA.'

THE text of Gil Vicente's play here given is that of the exceedingly rare first edition (1562). Apart from accents and punctuation, it is reproduced without alteration, unless a passage is marked by an asterisk, when the text of the *editio princeps* will be found in the foot-notes, in which variants of other editions are also given.

In these notes A represents the *editio princeps* (1562): *Copilaçam de todalas obras de Gil Vicente, a qval se reparte em cinco liuros. O Primeyro he de todas suas cousas de deuaçam. O segundo as comedias. O terceyro as tragicomedias. No quarto as farsas. No quinto as obras meudas. Emprimiose em a muy nobre e sempre leal cidade de Lixboa em casa de Joam Aluarez impressor del Rey nosso Senhor. Anno de* MDLXII. The second (1586) edition (B) is the *Copilaçam de todalas obras de Gil Vicente...Lixboa, por Andres Lobato, Anno de* MDLXXXVJ. A third edition in three volumes appeared in 1834 (C): *Obras de Gil Vicente, correctas e emendadas pelo cuidado e diligencia de J. V. Barreto Feio e J. G. Monteiro.* Hamburgo. 1834. This was based, although not always with scrupulous accuracy, on the *editio princeps,* and subsequent editions have faithfully adhered to that of 1834: *Obras,* 3 vol. Lisboa, 1852 (D), and *Obras,* Ed. Mendes dos Remedios, 3 vol. Coimbra 1907, 12, 14 (*Subsidios,* vol. 11, 15, 17)[1] (E). Although there has been a tendency of late to multiply editions of Gil Vicente no attempt has been made to produce a critical edition. It is generally felt that that must be left to the master-hand of Dona Carolina Michaëlis de Vasconcellos. Since the plays of Vicente number over forty the present edition is only a tentative step in this direction, but it may serve to show the need of referring to, and occasionally emending, the *editio princeps* in any future edition of the most national poet of Portugal.

Auto da Alma.	*The Soul's Journey.*
Este auto presente foy feyto aa muyto deuota raynha dona Lianor & representado ao muyto poderoso &	*This play was written for the very devout Queen Lianor and played before the very powerful and noble King*

---

[1] The Paris 1843 edition is the Hamburg 1834 edition with a different title-page. The *Auto da Alma* was published separately at Lisbon in 1902 and again (in part) in *Autos de Gil Vicente. Compilação e prefacio de Affonso Lopes Vieira,* Porto, 1916; while extracts appeared in *Portugal. An Anthology, edited with English versions, by George Young.* Oxford, 1916.

nobre Rey dom Emmanuel, seu yrmão, por seu mandado, na cidade de Lisboa nos paços da ribeyra em a noyte de endoenças. Era do Senhor de M. D & viij.

Argvmento.

Assi como foy cousa muyto necessaria auer nos caminhos estalagens pera repouso & refeyçam dos cansados caminhantes, assi foy cousa conveniente que nesta caminhante vida ouuesse hũa estalajadeyra para refeição & descanso das almas que vam caminhantes pera a eterna morada[1] de Deos. Esta estalajadeyra das almas he a madre sancta ygreja, a mesa he o altar, os mãjares as insignias da payxã. E desta perfiguraçã[2] trata a obra seguinte.

¶ Está posta hũa mesa cõ hũa cadeyra: vẽ a madre sancta ygreja cõ seus quatro doctores, Sancto Thomas, Sam Hieronymo, Sancto Ambrosio, Sancto Agostinho, & diz Agostinho.

Agost. Necessario foy, amigos,
que nesta triste carreyra
desta vida
pera os mui perigosos perigos
dos immigos
ouuesse algũa maneyra
de guarida.
Porque a humana transitoria
natureza vay cansada
em varias calmas
nesta carreyra da gloria
meritoria
foi necessario pensada
pera as almas
¶ Pousada com mantimentos,
mesa posta em clara luz,
sempre esperando,
com dobrados mantimentos
dos tormentos
que o filho de Deos na Cruz
comprou penando.
Sua morte foy auença,
dando, por darnos parayso,
a sua vida
apreçada sem detença,
por sentença
julgada a paga em prouiso
& recebida.
¶ Ha sua mortal empresa
foy sancta estalajadeyra
ygreja madre

Manoel, her brother, by his command, in the city of Lisbon at the Ribeira palace on the night of Thursday in Holy Week, in the year 1508.

Argument.

As it was very necessary that there should be inns upon the roads for the repose and refreshment of weary wayfarers so it was fitting that in this transitory life there should be an innkeeper for the refreshment and rest of the souls that go journeying to the everlasting abode of God. This innkeeper of souls is the Holy Mother Church, the table is the altar, the fare the emblems of the Passion. And this allegory is the theme of the following play.

(A table laid, with a chair. The Holy Mother Church comes with her four doctors St Thomas, St Jerome, St Ambrose and St Augustine, who says:)

1 *St Aug.* Friends, 'twas of necessity
That upon the gloomy way
Of this our life
Some sure refuge there should be
From the enemy
And dread dangers that alway
Therein are rife.
2 Since man's spirit migratory
In the journey to its goal
Is oft oppressed,
Weary in this transitory
Path to glory,
An inn was needed for the soul
To stay and rest.
3 An inn provided with its fare,
In clear light a table spread
Expectantly,
And laden with a double share
Of torments rare
That the Son of God, His life-blood shed,
Bought on the Tree.
4 Since by the covenant of His death
He gave, to give us Paradise,
Even His life,
Unwavering He rendereth
For us His breath,
Paying the full required price
Free from all strife.
5 His work as man was to enable
Our Mother Church thus to console,
Innkeeper lowly,

---

[1] *pera eterna morada* B.

[2] *prefiguraçã* B.

1. *pera mui p'rigosos p'rigos* C. *imigos* C.
2. *pensada* A, B. *pousada* C.
3. *Pousada com alimentos?*
4. *apressada* C.

consolar aa sua despesa
nesta mesa
qualquer alma caminheyra
com ho padre
e o anjo custodio ayo.
Alma que lhe he encomendada
se enfraquece
& lhe vay tomando rayo
de desmayo
se chegando a esta pousada
se guarece.

¶ Vẽ o anjo custodio cõ a alma & diz.

Anjo. ¶ Alma humana formada
de nenhũa cousa feyta
muy preciosa,
de corrupçam separada,
& esmaltada
naquella fragoa perfeyta
gloriosa;
¶ planta neste valle posta
pera dar celestes flores
olorosas
& pera serdes tresposta
em a alta costa
onde se criam primores
mais que rosas;
planta soes & caminheyra,
que ainda que estais, vos his
donde viestes;
vossa patria verdadeyra
he ser herdeyra
da gloria que conseguis,
anday prestes.
¶ Alma bemauenturada,
dos anjos tanto querida,
nam durmais,
hum punto nam esteis parada,
que a jornada
muyto em breue he fenecida
se atentais.
Alma. Anjo que soes minha guarda
Olhay por minha fraqueza
terreal:
de toda a parte aja resguarda
que nam arda
a minha preciosa riqueza
principal.
¶ Cercayme sempre oo redor
porque vin muy temerosa
da contenda:
Oo precioso defensor,
meu favor,
vossa espada lumiosa
me defenda.
¶ Tende sempre mão em mim

And minister at this very table,
Most serviceable,
Unto every wayfaring soul,
With the Father Holy
6 And its Guardian Angel's care.
The soul to her protection given
If, weak with sin
And yielding almost to despair,
It onward fare
And to reach this inn have striven,
Finds health within.

The Guardian Angel comes with the Soul and says:

7 *Angel.* Human soul, by God created
Out of nothingness yet wrought
As of great price,
From corruption separated,
Sublimated,
To glorious perfection brought
By skilled device;
8 Plant that in this valley growest
Flowers celestial for to give
Of fairest scent,
Hence to that high hill thou goest
Where thou knowest
Even than roses graces thrive
More excellent.
9 Plant wayfaring, since thy spirit,
Scarce staying, to its first origin
Must still begone,
Thy true country is to inherit
By thy merit
That glory that thou mayest win:
O hasten on.
10 Soul that art thus trebly blest
By such angels' love attended,
Sink not asleep,
Nor one instant pause nor rest,
Thou journeyest
On a way that soon is ended
If watch thou keep.
11 *Soul.* Guardian angel, o'er me still
Keep thy ward that am so frail
And of the earth,
On all sides thy watch fulfil
That nothing kill
My true wealth nor e'er prevail
O'er its high worth.
12 Ever encompass me and shield,
For this conflict with great fear
Fills all my sense,
Noble protector in this field,
Lest I should yield,
Let thy gleaming sword be near
For my defence.
13 Still uphold me and sustain

6. *em chegando?*

porque ey medo de empeçar
& de cayr.
Anjo. Pera isso sam & a isso vim
mas em fim
cumpreuos de me ajudar
a resistir.
Nam vos occupem vaydades,
riquezas nem seus debates,
olhay por vos:
que pompas, honrras, herdades,
& vaydades
sam embates & combates
pera vos.
¶ Vosso liure aluidrio,
isento, forro, poderoso,
vos he dado
pollo diuinal poderio
& senhorio,
que possais fazer glorioso
vosso estado.
Deuvos liure entendimento
& vontade libertada
& a memoria,
que tenhais em vosso tento
fundamento
que soes por elle criada
pera a gloria.
¶ E vendo Deos que o metal,
em que vos pos a estilar
pera merecer,
que era muyto fraco & mortal,
& por tal
me manda a vos ajudar
& defender.
Andemos a estrada nossa,
olhay nam torneis a tras
que o ĩmigo
aa vossa vida gloriosa
pora grosa.
Nam creaes a Satanas,
vosso perigo.
¶ Continuay ter cuydado
na fim de vossa jornada
& a memoria
que o spirito atalayado
do peccado
caminha sem temer nada
pera a gloria.
e nos laços infernaes
& nas redes de tristura
tenebrosas
da carreyra que passaes
nam cayaes:
sigua vossa fermosura
as gloriosas.

For I fear lest I may stumble,
Fail and fall.
A. Therefore came I, nor in vain,
Yet amain
Must thou help me too, and humble
Resist all:
14 Even all the world's debate
Of riches and of vanity,
Seek thou for grace,
Since pomp and honour, high estate
Vainly elate,
Are but a stumbling-block to thee,
No resting-place.
15 Power uncontrolled is thine,
And an independent will
Unbound by fate.:
Even so in His might divine
Did God design
That thou in glory might'st fulfil
Thy heavenly state.
16 He gave thee understanding pure,
Imparted to thee memory,
Free will is thine,
That so thou mayest e'er endure
With purpose sure,
Knowing that he has fashioned thee
To be divine.
17 And since God knew the mortal frame
Wherein he placed thee to distil,
(So to win His praise)
Was metal weak and prone to shame,
Therefore I came
Thee to protect—it was His will—
And to upraise.
18 Let us go forth upon our way.
Turn not thou back, for then indeed
The enemy
Upon thy glorious life straightway
Will make assay.
But unto Satan pay no heed
Who lurks for thee.
19 And still the goal seek thou to win
Carefully at thy journey's end,
And be it clear
That the spirit e'er at watch within
Against all sin
Upon salvation's path may wend
Without a fear.
20 In snares of Hell that shall waylay,
Dark and awful wiles among,
Thee to molest,
As thou advancest on thy way
Fall not nor stray,
But let thy beauty join the throng
Of spirits blest.

---

13. *a resistir* A, B, C. *e resistir* D.
18. *atras* B. *imigo* B. 20. *trestura* B.

¶ Adiantase o Anjo e vem o diabo a ella e diz o diabo.

¶ Tam depressa, oo delicada
alua pomba, pera onde his?
quem vos engana,
& vos leua tam cansada
por estrada
que soomente nam sentis
se soes humana?
Nam cureis de vos matar
que ainda estais em idade
de crecer.
Tempo hahi pera folgar
& caminhar,
Viuey aa vossa vontade
& a avey prazer.
¶ Gozay, gozay dos bẽs da terra,
procuray por senhorios
& aueres.
Quẽ da vida vos desterra
aa triste serra?
quem vos falla em desuarios
por prazeres?
Esta vida he descanso
doce & manso,
nam cureis doutro parayso:
quem vos põe em vosso siso
outro remanso?
Alma. ¶ Nam me detenhaes aqui,
Deyxayme yr, q̃ em al me fundo.

Diabo. Oo descansay neste mundo,
que todos fazem assi.
Nam sam em balde os aueres,
Nam sam em balde os deleytes
& farturas*,
nam sam de balde os prazeres
& comeres,
tudo sam puros affeytes
das creaturas:
pera os homẽs se criarão.
Dae folga a vossa possagem
doje a mais,
descansay, pois descansarão
os que passaram
por esta mesma romagem
que leuais.
O que a vontade quiser,
quanto o corpo desejar,
tudo se faça:
zombay de quem vos quiser
reprender,
querendovos marteyrar
tam de graça.
Tornarame se a vos fora,

The Angel goes forward and the Devil comes to the Soul and says:

21 Whither so swift thy flight,
Delicate dove most white?
Who thus deceives thee?
And weary still doth goad
Along this road,
Yea and of human sense,
Even, bereaves thee?
22 Seek not to hasten hence
Since thou hast life and youth
For further growth.
There is a time for haste,
A time for leisure:
Live at thy will and rest,
Taking thy pleasure.
23 Enjoy, enjoy the goods of Earth,
And great estates seek to possess
And worldly treasures.
Who to the hills, exiled from mirth,
Thus sends thee forth?
Who speaks to thee of foolishness
Instead of pleasures?
24 This life is all a pleasaunce fair,
Soft, debonair,
Look for no other paradise:
Who bids thee seek, with false advice,
Refuge elsewhere?
25 *Soul.* Hinder me not here nor stay,
For far other thoughts are mine.
Devil. To worldly ease thy thought incline
Since all men incline this way.
26 And not for nothing are delights,
And not in vain possessions sent
And fortune's prize,
And not for nought are pleasure's rites
And banquet-nights:
All these are for man's ornament
And galliardize;
27 For mortal men is their array.
So let delight thy woes assuage,
Henceforth recline
And rest, since rest likewise had they
Who went this way,
Even this very pilgrimage
That now is thine.
28 And whatsoe'er thy body crave,
Even as thy will desire,
So let it be;
And laugh thou at the censors grave,
Whoso would have
Thee torturèd by sufferings dire
So uselessly.
29 I would not, being thou, go forth,

---

20. *vem o Diabo e diz* C. 22. *E havei prazer* C. 23. *& auereis?* B. *que da vida vos desterra* B. 26. *nam som em balde os deleytes* B. *fortunas* A, B, C, D, E. *criaturas* C. 27. *possagem* A, B. *passagem* C.

his tam triste, atribulada
que he tormenta:
senhora, vos soes senhora
emperadora,
nam deueis a ninguem nada,
sede isenta.

Anjo. Oo anday, quem vos detem?
Como vindes pera a gloria
devagar!
Oo meu Deos, oo summo bem!
Ja ninguem
nam se preza da vitoria
em se saluar.
Ja cansais, alma preciosa?
Tão asinha desmayaes?
Sede esforçada:
Oo como virieis trigosa
& desejosa,
se visseis quanto ganhaes
nesta jornada.
Caminhemos, caminhemos,
esforçay ora, alma sancta
esclarecida.

¶ Adiantase o anjo & torna Satanas.

Que vaydades & que estremos
tam supremos!
Pera que he essa pressa tanta?
Tende vida.
¶ His muy desautorizada,
descalça, pobre, perdida
de remate,
nam leuais de vosso nada
amargurada:
assi passais esta vida
em disparate.
¶ Vesti ora este brial,
metey o braço por aqui,
ora esperay.
Oo como vem tão real!
isto tal
me parece bem a mi:
ora anday.
Hũs chapins aueis mister
de Valença, muy fermosos*,
eylos aqui:
Agora estais vos molher
de parecer.
Põde os braços presumptuosos,
isso si,
passeayuos muy pomposa,
¶ daqui pera ali & de laa por ca,
& fantasiay.

So sad and troubled lies the way,
'Tis cruelty,
And thou art of imperial worth
And royal birth,
To none thou needest homage pay,
Then be thou free.
30 *Angel.* O who thus hinders thee?
On, on!
How loiterest thou on glory's path
So slowly!
O God! sole consolation!
Now is there none
Who of that victory honour hath
That is most holy.
31 Soul, already dost thou tire
Sinking so soon beneath thy burden?
Nay, soul, take heart!
Ah, with what a glowing fire
Of desire
Cam'st thou could'st thou see what
Were then thy part. [guerdon
32 Forward, forward let us go:
Be of good cheer, O soul made holy
By this thy strife.

(*The Angel goes forward and Satan returns.*)

Devil. But what is all this coil and woe?
Why to and fro
Flutterest thou in haste and folly?
Nay, live thy life.
33 For very piteous is thy plight,
Poor, barefoot, ruined utterly,
In bitterness,
Carrying nothing to delight
As thine by right,
And all thy life is thus to thee
A thing senseless.
34 But don this dress, thy arm goes here,
Put it through now, even thus, now
For me to see: [stay
O how nobly dost appear
And very fair,
For verily all this array
Best pleases me.
35 And here are slippers for thy need
From Valença, fair to see,
Even here:
Now very smart, as I decreed,
Art thou indeed;
So move thy arms presumptuously
And have no fear.
36 Now go thy way in pride's gay power
This way and that and up and down
All at thy pleasure;

35. *Huns chapins aueis mister De Valença, eylos aqui* A, B, C, D, E.
36. *de la pera ca* C.

Agora estais vos fermosa
como a rosa,
tudo vos muy bem estaa:
descansay.

Torna o anjo a alma dizẽdo.

Anjo. ¶ Que andais aqui fazendo?

Alma. Faço o q̃ vejo fazer
pollo mundo.
Anjo. Oo Alma, hisuos perdẽdo,
correndo vos his meter
no profundo.
Quanto caminhais auante
tanto vos tornais a tras
& a trauees,
tomastes ante com ante
por marcante
o cossayro satanas
porque querees.
¶ Oo caminhay com cuydado
que a Virgem gloriosa
vos espera:
deyxais vosso principado
desherdado,
engeytais a gloria vossa
& patria vera.
Deyxay esses chapins ora
& esses rabos tam sobejos,
que his carregada,
nam vos tome a morte agora
tam senhora,
nem sejais com tais desejos
sepultada.

Alma. ¶ Anday, day meca essa mão:
anday vos, que eu yrey
quanto poder.

Adiãtese o anjo & torna o diabo.

Dia. Todas as cousas cõ rezão
tem çazam.
Senhora, eu vos direy
meu parecer:
hahi tempo de folgar
& idade de crecer
& outra idade
de mandar e triumphar,
& apanhar
& acquirir prosperidade
a que poder.
¶ Ainda he cedo pera a morte:

Fair now as fairest rose in flower
Thy beauty's dower,
And all becomes thee as thine own:
Now live at leisure.

(*The Angel returns to the Soul, saying*)

37 *Angel.* What is this that thou art
doing?
Soul. In the world's mirror ev'n as
I see
I do in this.
Angel. O soul, thou compassest thy ruin
And rushest forward foolishly
To the abyss.
38 For every step that onward fares
One step back, one step aside
Thou takest still,
And buyest eagerly the wares
That pirate bears,
Even Satan, by thee glorified
Of thy free will.
39 O journey onward still with care
For the Virgin with the elect
Doth thee await:
Thou leavest desolate and bare
Thy kingdom rare,
And thine own glory dost reject
And true estate.
40 But cast these slippers now aside,
This gaudy dress and its long train,
Thou art all bowed,
Lest Death come on thee unespied
And in thy pride
These thy desires and trappings vain
Prove but thy shroud.
41 *Soul.* Go forward, stretch thy hand
to save,
Go forward, I will follow thee
As best I may.

(*The Soul goes forward and the Devil
returns.*)

Devil. All things in light of reason
grave
Their seasons have.
And I to thee will, O lady,
My counsel say:
42 There is a time here for delight
And an age is given for growth,
Another age
To tread in lordly triumph's might
In the world's despite,
Gaining ease and riches both
On life's full stage.
43 It is too early yet to die,

38. *marcante* A, B. *mercante* C, D. *querês* C, D.
41. *poder* A; *puder* B, C. *Todas cousas com razão Tem sazão* C.
42. *poder* A, B: *puder* C.

tempo ha de arrepender,
e yr ao ceo.
Pondevos a for da corte,
desta sorte
viua vosso parecer,
que tal naceo.
O ouro pera que he?
& as pedras preciosas
& brocados,
& as sedas pera que?
Tende per fee
q̃ pera as almas mais ditosas
foram dados*.
¶ Vedes aqui hum colar
douro muy bem esmaltado
& dez aneis.
Agora estais vos pera casar
& namorar:
neste espelho vos vereis
& sabereis
q̃ nam vos ey de enganar.
E poreis estes pendentes,
em cada orelha seu,
isso si,
que as pessoas diligentes
sam prudentes:
agora vos digo eu
que vou contente daqui.

ALMA. ¶ Oo como estou preciosa,
tam dina pera seruir
& sancta pera adorar!
ANJO. Oo alma despiadosa,
perfiosa,
quem vos deuesse fugir
mais que guardar!
Pondes terra sobre terra,
que esses ouros terra sam:
oo senhor,
porque permites tal guerra
que desterra
ao reyno da confusam
o teu lauor?
¶ Nam hieis mais despejada
& mais liure da primeyra
pera andar?
Agora estais carregada
& embaraçada
com cousas que ha derradeyra
ham de ficar.
Tudo isso se descarregá
ao porto da sepultura:
alma sancta, quem vos cega,

Time later to repent on earth
And to seek Heaven.
Then cease with other souls to vie,
And quietly
Enjoy the nature that at birth
To thee was given.
44 What, think'st thou, is the use for gold
And what the use for precious stones
And for brocade,
And all these silks so manifold?
Ah surely hold
That for the souls, the blessed ones,
They were all made.
45 See here a necklace in its pride
Of skilfully enamelled gold,
Here are rings ten:
Now may'st thou win the hearts of
Fit for a bride. [men,
In this mirror thou may'st behold
Thyself and see
That I am not deceiving thee.
46 And here are ear-rings, put them on
One in each ear duly now:
Even so;
For things thus diligently done
Prove wisdom won,
And now I may to thee avow
That right well pleased I hence shall
go.
47 *Soul.* O how lovely is my state,
How is it for service meet,
And for holy adoration!
Angel. Cruel soul and obstinate,
Rather thereat
Should I shun thee than still treat
Of thy salvation.
48 Earth upon earth is this thy store,
Since but earth is all this gold.
O God most high
Wherefore permittest thou such war
That, as of yore,
To Babel's kingdom from thy fold
Thy creatures hie?
49 Was it not easier journeying
At first, more free than that thou
With all this train, [hast
Hampered and bowed with many a
That now doth cling [thing
About thee, but which at the last
Must here remain?
50 All is disgorged and left behind
At the entrance to the tomb.
Who, holy soul, doth thee thus blind

43. *naceo* A, B; *nasceo* C (cf. infra 102 *nascido* A; 106 *nacido* A).
44. *dadas* A, B; *dados* C.
45. *esmaltados* B. *neste espelho & sabereis* B. *Neste espelho bem lavrado Vos vereis?* (omitting *& sabereis—enganar*).
46. *em cada orelha o seu* B.
47. *despiedosa* C.
49. *á derradeira* C.

vos carrega
dessa vaã desauentura?
Alma. Isto nam me pesa nada

mas à fraca natureza
me embaraça.
Ja nam posso dar passada
de cansada:
tanta é minha fraqueza
& tam sem graça.
Senhor hidevos embora,
que remedio em mi nam sento,
ja estou tal.
Anjo. Sequer day dous passos ora
atee onde mora
a que tem o mantimento
celestial.
¶ Ireis ali repousar,
comereis algũs bocados
confortosos,
porque a hospeda he sem par
em agasalhar
os que vem atribulados
& chorosos.
Alma. He lõge?
Anjo. Aqui muy perto.
Esforçay, nam desmayeis
& andemos,
que ali ha todo concerto
muy certo:
quantas cousas querereis
tudo temos*.

¶ A hospeda tem graça tanta,
faruosha tantos fauores.
Alma. Quem he ella?
Anjo. He a madre ygreja sancta,

e os seus sanctos doutores
i com ella.
Ireis di muy despejada
chea do Spirito Sancto
& muy fermosa:
ho alma sede esforçada,
outra passada,
que nam tendes de andar tãto
a ser esposa.

Diabo. ¶ Esperay, onde vos his?
Essa pressa tam sobeja
He ja pequice.
Como, vos que presumís
consentis
continuardes a ygreja
sem velhice?
Dayuos, dayuos a prazer,

Thyself to bind
With such vain misfortune's doom!
51 *Soul.* Nay this doth scarcely on
me weigh:
It is my poor weak mortal nature
That bows me down.
So weary am I I must stay
Nor go my way,
So void of grace, so frail a creature
Am I now grown.
52 But leave me, pray Sir, and forgive,
I hope not further to advance
So fallen I.
Angel. But two steps more to where
She who will give [doth live
To thee celestial sustenance
Charitably.
53 Thither shalt thou go and rest,
And shalt taste there of that fare
New strength to borrow:
Unrivalled is that hostess blest
To give of the best
To those who weeping come to her,
Laden with sorrow.
54 *Soul.* Is it far off?
Angel. Nay very near.
Be not downcast, but now be brave,
And let us go,
For every remedy and cheer
Is certain here.
And whatsoever thou would'st have
We can bestow.
55 Such grace is hers that naught can
smirch,
Such favours will she show to thee,
That innkeeper.
Soul. Her name?
Angel. The Holy Mother Church.
And holy doctors thou shalt see
Are there with her.
56 Joyful thence shall thy going be,
Filled then with the Holy Spirit
And beautified:
O soul take heart, courageously
One step for thee,
Nay scarce one step, and thou shalt
To be a bride. [merit
57 *Devil.* Stay, whither art thou going
now?
Such haste is mere unseemly rage
And foolishness:
What, thou so puffed with pride,
Thus meekly bow [canst thou
To go on churchward e'er old age
Doth on thee press?
58 Let pleasure, pleasure rule thy ways,

50. *van* C.
54. *muito certo?*; *tudo tendes* A, B, C, D, E.
52. *mim* C.
56. *Siprito* B.

q muytas horas ha nos annos
que laa vem.
Na hora que a morte vier
Como xiquer
se perdoão quantos dannos
a alma tem.
Olhay por vossa fazenda:
tendes hũas scripturas
de hũs casais
de que perdeis grande renda.
He contenda
que leyxarão aas escuras
vossos pays;
he demanda muy ligeyra,
litigios que sam vencidos
em um riso:
citay as partes terça feyra
de maneyra
como nam fiquem perdidos
& auey siso.
ALMA. Calte por amor de deos
leyxame, nam me persigas,
bem abasta
estoruares os ereos
dos altos ceos,
que a vida em tuas brigas
se me gasta.
Leyxame remediar
o que tu cruel danaste
sem vergonha,
que nam me posso abalar
nem chegar
ao logar onde gaste
esta peçonha.
ANJO. ¶ Vedes aqui a pousada
verdadeyra & muy segura
a quem quer vida.
YGREJA. Oo como vindes cansada
& carregada!
ALMA. Venho por minha ventura
amortecida.
YGREJA. Quem sois? pera onde andais?
ALMA. Nam sey pera onde vou,
sou saluagem,
sou hũa alma que peccou
culpas mortaes
contra o Deos que me criou
aa sua imagem.
¶ Sou a triste, sem ventura,
criada resplandecente
& preciosa,
angelica em fermosura
& per natura
come rayo reluzente
lumiosa.

For many hours in years to roll
To thee are given,
And when death comes to end thy
If prayer thou raise, [days,
Then all sins that can vex a soul
Shall be forgiven.
59 Look to thy wealth and property:
There is a group of houses should
Be thine by right,
Great source of income would they
Unhappily [be,
At thy parents' death the matter stood
In no clear light.
60 The case is simple, 'tis averred
Such lawsuits in a trice are won
At laughter's spell:
Next Tuesday let the case be heard
And, in a word,
Finish thou well what is begun.
Be sensible.
61 *Soul.* O silence for the love of God,
Persecute me no more: thy hate
Doth it not suffice
High Heaven's heirs that it hinder
From their abode? [should
My life to thee early and late
I sacrifice.
62 But leave me: so I may efface
The cruel wrong that shamelessly
Thou hast thus wrought;
For now I have scarce breathing-
To reach that place [space
Where for this poison there may be
Some antidote.
63 *Angel.* See the inn: a sure retreat,
Even for all those a true home
Who would have life.
Church. O laden with sore toil and
O tired feet! [heat!
Soul. Yea, for I destined was to come
Weary of strife.
64 *Church.* Who art thou? whither wouldst thou win?
Soul. I know not whither, outcast,
At fortune's whim, [fated
A soul unholy, steepèd in
Its mortal sin,
Against the God who had created
Me like to Him.
65 I am that soul ill-starred, unblest,
That by nature shone in gleaming
Robe of white,
Of angel's beauty once possessed,
Yea, loveliest,
Like a ray refulgent streaming
Filled with light.

58. *como se quer* C. 59. *escripturas* C. 61. *estrouares* B. *hereos* C.
62. *damnaste* C. 65. *como o raio* C.

E por minha triste sorte
& diabolicas maldades
violentas
estou mais morta que a morte,
sem deporte,
carregada de vaydades
peçonhentas.
¶ Sou a triste, sem meezinha,
peccadora abstinada.
perfiosa,
pella triste culpa minha
mui mesquinha
a todo mal inclinada
& deleytosa.
Desterrey da minha mente
os meus perfeytos arreos
naturaes,
nam me prezey de prudente
mas contente
me gozey com os trajos feos
mundanaes.
¶ Cada passo me perdi
em lugar de merecer,
eu sou culpada:
auey piedade de mi
que nam me vi,
perdi meu inocente ser
& sou danada.
E por mais graueza sento
nam poderme arrepender
quanto queria,
que meu triste pensamento
sendo isento
nam me quer obedecer
como soya.
¶ Socorrey, hospeda senhora,
que a mão de Satanas
me tocou,
e sou ja de mi tam fora
que agora
nam sey se auante se a traz
nem como vou.
Consolay minha fraqueza
com sagrada yguaria,
que pereço,
por vossa sancta nobreza,
que he franqueza,
porque o que eu merecia
bem conheço.
¶ Conheçome por culpada
& digo diante vos
minha culpa.
Senhora, quero pousada,
day passada,
pois que padeceo por nos

66 And by my ill-omened fate
My atrocious devilries,
Sins treasonous,
More dead than death is now my
Bowed with this weight [state
That nought can lighten, vanities
Most poisonous.
67 I am a sinner obstinate,
Perverse, that know no remedy
For this my plight,
Oppressed by guilt most obdurate,
And profligate,
Inclined to evil constantly
And all delight.
68 And I banished from my lore
All my perfect ornaments
And natural graces,
By prudence I set no store
But evermore
Rejoiced in all these vile vestments
And worldly places.
69 At each step taken in earthly cares
I further sank away from praise,
Earning but blame:
Have mercy upon one who fares
Lost unawares:
For, innocence lost, I might not raise
Myself from shame.
70 And, for my greater evil, I
Can no more repent me fully,
Since in new mood
My thoughts are mutinous and cry
For liberty,
Unwilling to obey me duly
As once they would.
71 O help me, lady innkeeper,
For Satan even now his hand
Doth on me lay,
And so grievously I err
In my despair
That I know not if I go or stand
Or backward stray.
72 Succour thou my helplessness
And strengthen me with holy fare,
For I perish,
Of thy noble saintliness
Liberal to bless,
For as to my deserts I dare
No hope cherish.
73 I acknowledge all my sin
And before thee meekly thus
Forgiveness crave.
O Lady, let me now but win
Into thine inn,
Since One suffered even for us,

---

66. *violentas* A. *& tromentas* B.
67. *mezinha* B. *obstinada* C. *a todo o mal.* C; *e todo o mal.* D.
68. *arreos, feos* C; *c'os trajos* C. 69. *logar* C. *damnada* C. 71. *soccorey* C.

quem nos desculpa.
Mandayme ora agasalhar,
capa dos desemparados,
ygreja madre.
YGREGA. Vindevos aqui assentar
muy de vagar,
que os manjares são guisados
por Deos Padre.
¶ Sancto Agostinho doutor,
Geronimo, Ambrosio, Sã Thomas,
meus pilares,
serui aqui por meu amor
a qual milhor,
& tu, alma, gostaraas
meus manjares.
Ide aa sancta cosinha,
tornemos esta alma em si,
porque mereça
de chegar onde caminha
& se detinha:
pois que Deos a trouxe aqui
nam pereça.

¶ Em quanto estas cousas passam Satanas passea fazendo muytas vascas & vem outro & diz.

DIABO. ¶ Como andas desasossegado.
DIABO. Arço em fogo de pesar.
OUTRO. Que ouueste?
DIABO. Ando tam desatinado
de enganado
que nam posso repousar
que me preste.
Tinha hũa alma enganada
ja quasi pera infernal
mui acesa.
OUTRO. E quem ta levou forçada?
DIABO. O da espada.
OUTRO. Ja melle fez outra tal
bulra como essa.
¶ Tinha outra alma ja vencida
em ponto de se enforcar
de desesperada,
a nos toda offerecida
& eu prestes pera a levar
arrastada;
e elle fella chorar tanto
que as lagrimas corriã
polla terra.
Blasfemey entonces tanto
que meus gritos retiniam
polla serra.
¶ Mas faço conta que perdi,
outro dia ganharey,
e ganharemos.

That He might save.
74 Bid me welcome, Mother holy,
Shield of all who are forsaken
Utterly.
Church. Enter to thy seat there
Yet come slowly, [lowly,
For the viands thou see'st were baken
By God most high.
75 Lo ye my pillars, doctor, saint,
Ambrose, Thomas and Jerome
And Augustine,
In my service wax not faint,
Nor show constraint,
And to thee, soul, shall be welcome
This fare of mine.
76 To the holy kitchen go:
Let us this frail soul restore,
And cherish
That she have grace her path to
And even so [know,
By God brought hither never more
May perish.

(*Meanwhile Satan goes to and fro, cutting many capers, and another devil comes and says:*)

77 *2nd D.* You're like a lion in a cage.
1st D. I'm all afire, with anger blind.
2nd D. Why, what's the matter?
1st D. To be so taken in, my rage
Can nought assuage
Nor any rest be to my mind;
For, as I flatter
78 Myself, I had by honeyed word
Deceived a certain soul, all quick
For fires of Hell.
2nd D. Who made you throw it
1st D. He of the sword. [overboard?
2nd D. He played just such another
On me as well. [trick
79 For I had overcome a soul,
Ready to hang itself, unsteady
In its despair;
Yes, it was given to us whole
And I myself was making ready
To drag't down there.
80 And lo he made it weep and weep
So that the tears ran down along
The very ground:
You might have heard my curses
And cries of rage echo among [deep
The hills around.
81 But I have hopes that what I've lost
Some other day I shall regain,
So will we all.

---

74. *devagar* C. 75. *Jeronimo, Ambrosio e Thomaz* C, D. *e qual* D. *melhor* C, D.
76. *troxe* B. *passeia* C. *vem outro Diabo* C. 77. *dessocegado* C, D.
79. *Tinha outra alma vencida* B. 80. *fê-la* C, D.

Diabo. Nam digo eu, yrmão, assi,

mas a esta tornarey
& veremos.
Tornala ey a affogar
depois que ella sayr fora
da ygreja
& começar de caminhar:
hei de apalpar
se venceram ainda agora
esta peleja.

Alma com o Anjo.

¶ Vos nam me desampareis,
senhor meu anjo custodio.
Oo increos
imigos, que me quereis
que ja sou fora do odio
de meu Deos?
Leyxaime ja, tentadores,
neste conuite prezado
do Senhor,
guisado aos peccadores
com as dores
de Christo crucificado,
Redemptor.

¶ Estas cousas estando a alma assentada à mesa & o anjo junto com ella em pee, vem os doutores com quatro bacios de cosinha cubertos cantando Vexila regis* prodeunt. E postos na mesa, Sancto Agostinho diz.

Agost. Vos, senhora conuidada,
nesta cea soberana
celestial
aueis mister ser apartada
& transportada
de toda a cousa mundana
terreal.
Cerray os olhos corporaes,
deytay ferros aos danados
apetitos,
caminheyros infernaes,
pois buscaes
os caminhos bem guiados
dos contritos.
Ygreja. Benzey a mesa, senhor,
& pera consolaçam
da conuidada,
seja a oraçam de dor
sobre o tenor
da gloriosa payxam
consagrada.
E vos, alma, rezareis,
contemplando as viuas dores

1st D. I, brother, cannot share your
trust,
But I will tempt this soul again
Whate'er befall.
82 With new promises will I woo her
When from the Church she shall have
Forth to the street [come
Upon her journey: I will to her,
And beshrew her
If I turn not all their triumph
To defeat.

(*The Soul enters with the Angel.*)

83 *Soul.* O let not thy protection fail me,
Guardian angel, help thy child.
O foes most base,
Infidels, why would you assail me
Who to my God am reconciled
And in His grace?
84 Leave me, O ye tempters, leave
Unto this most precious feast
Of Him who died,
Served to sinners for reprieve
Of those who grieve
For their Redeemer Lord, the Christ
And crucified.

(*While the Soul is seated at the table and the Angel standing by her side, the Doctors come with four covered kitchen dishes, singing* Vexilla regis prodeunt, *and after placing them on the table, St Augustine says:*)

85 *St Aug.* Lady, thou that to this feast,
Supper of celestial fare
Nobly divine,
Comest as a bidden guest
Must now divest
Thyself of worldly thought and care
That once was thine.
86 Then thy body's eyes must close
And in fetters sure be tied
Fierce appetite,
Treacherous guides, infernal foes:
Thy ways are those
That are a safe support and guide
For the contrite.
87 *Church.* Sir, by thee be the table
In thy benedictory prayer, [blest,
To bring relief
And new strength to this our guest,
Be there expressed
The Passion's glory in despair
And all its grief.
88 Thou, O soul, with orisons,
The Virgin's sorrows contemplating

81. *asi* B.
82. *affogar* A; *affagar* C. *Entra a Alma, con o Anjo* C, D.
84. *Vexilla* C.
pro Deum A, B; *prodeunt* C.

da senhora,
vos outros respondereis
pois que fostes rogadores
atee agora.

Oraçã ꝑa Santo Agostinho.

¶ Alto Deos marauilhoso
que o mundo visitaste
em carne humana,
neste valle temeroso
& lacrimoso
tua gloria nos mostraste
soberana;
e teu filho delicado,
mimoso da diuindade
& natureza,
per todas partes chagado
& muy sangrado
polla nossa infirmidade
& vil fraqueza.
¶ Oo emperador celeste,
Deos alto muy poderoso
essencial,
que pollo homem que fizeste
offereceste
o teu estado glorioso
a ser mortal.
¶ E tua filha, madre, esposa,
horta nobre, frol dos ceos,
Virgem Maria,
mansa pomba gloriosa
o quam chorosa
quando o seu Filho e Deos*
padecia.
Oo lagrymas preciosas,
de virginal coraçam
estilladas,
correntes das dores vossas
com os olhos da perfeyçam
derramadas!
¶ Quem hũa soo podera ver
vira claramente nella
aquella dor,
aquella pena & padecer
com que choraueis, donzella,
vosso amor.
¶ E quando vos amortecida
se lagrymas vos faltauam
nam faltaua
a vosso filho & vossa vida
chorar as que lhe ficauam
de quando orava.
Porque muyto mais sentia
pollos seus padecimentos
vervos tal,

Abide even there,
And ye others make response
Since for this have you been waiting
Wrapped in prayer.

(*St Augustine's prayer:*)

89 God whose might on high appears
Who camest to this world
In human guise,
In this vale of many fears
And sullen tears
Thy great glory hast unfurled
Before our eyes;
90 And thy Son most delicate
By His natural majesty
Of divine birth,
Ah, of blood and wounds how great
Is now his state
For our vile infirmity
And little worth.
91 O Thou ruler of the sky
High God of power divine,
Enduring might,
Who for thy creature, man, to die
Didst not deny
Thy Godhead, and madest Thine
Our mortal plight.
92 And thy daughter, mother, bride,
Noble flower of the skies,
The Virgin blest,
Gentle Dove, when her Son died,
God crucified,
Ah what tears shed by those eyes
Her grief attest.
93 O most precious tears that well
From that virgin heart distilled
One by one,
Flowing at thy sorrow's spell
They those perfect eyes have filled
And still flow on.
94 Who but one of them might have
In it most manifestly
That grief to prove,
Even that woe and suffering grave
Which then overwhelmèd thee
For thy dear love.
95 Fainting then with grief if failed
Thy tears, yet Him they might not [fail,
Thy Life, thy Son,
Who unto the Cross was nailed,
Even fresh tears that could avail,
In prayer begun.
96 For far greater woe was His
When He saw thee faint and languish
In thy distress,

---

88. *até 'gora* C, D. 90. *pela nossa* C, D. 91. *polo homem* C, E. B omits 90 and 91. 92. *O quão chorosa Quando o seu Deos padecia* A, B, C, D, E. 93. *com os* A, B. *c'os olhos* C, D. 94. *podera ver* A, B; *podera haver* C, D. 96. *vermos* B.

mais que quanto padecia
lhe doya,
& dobrava seus tormentos
vosso mal.
¶ Se se podesse dizer,
se se podesse rezar
tanta dor;
se se podesse fazer
podermos ver
qual estaueis ao clauar
do Redemptor.
Oo fermosa face bella,
oo resplandor divinal,
que sentistes
quando a cruz se pos aa vella
& posto nella
o filho celestial
que paristes!
Vendo por cima da gente
assomar vosso conforto
tam chagado,
crauado tam cruelmente,
& vos presente,
vendo vos ser mãy do morto
& justiçado.
O rainha delicada,
sanctidade escurecida
quem nam chora
em ver morta & debruçada
a auogada,
a força de nossa vida
* [pecadora]!

Ambrosio. Isto chorou Hyeremias
sobre o monte de Sion
ha ja dias,
porque sentio que o Messias
era nossa redempçam.
E choraua a sem ventura
triste de Jerusalem
homecida,
matando contra natura
seu Deos nascido em Belem
nesta vida.
Geronymo. Quem vira o sancto cordeyro
antre os lobos humildoso
escarnecido,
julgado pera o marteyro
do madeyro,
seu rosto aluo & fermoso
muy cuspido!

Agost. Bẽze a mesa.

A bençam do padre eternal
& do filho que por nos
sofreo tal dor

More than His own agonies,
And doubled is
All His torture at thy anguish
Measureless.
97 For no words have ever told
No prayer or litany wailed
Such grief and loss:
Our weak thought may not enfold
Nor thee behold
As thou wert when He was nailed
Upon the Cross.
98 For to thee, O lovely face,
Wherein Heaven's beauty shone,
What woe was given
When the Cross on high they place
And thereupon
Nailèd the Son of Heaven,
Even thy Son!
99 Over the crowd's heads on high
He who was ever thy delight
Came to thy sight,
To the Cross nailèd cruelly
Thou standing by,
The mother of Him who died
There crucified!
100 O frail Queen of Holiness,
Who would not thus weep to see
Thee fainting fall
And lie there all motionless,
Thou patroness
Who dost still uphold and free
The life of all!
101 *St Ambrose.* Thus of yore did Jeremiah
On Mount Sion make lament
In days long spent,
For he knew that the Messiah
Was for our salvation sent.
102 And he mourned the misery
Of ill-starred Jerusalem,
The murderess,
Who should kill unnaturally
Her God born in Bethlehem
Our life to bless.
103 *St Jerome.* O the Holy Lamb to see
Humble amid the wolves' despite,
With mockery fraught,
Condemned to suffer cruelly
Upon the tree,
And that face, so fair and white,
Thus set at nought!

St Augustine. (*He blesses the table*).

104 The Eternal Father's blessing rest,
And of the Son, who suffered thus
Even for us,

97. *cravar* C.
100. *morta debruçada* C. *de nossa vida* A, B; *da nossa vida* C, D. *pecadora?* or *e senhora?* or *nesta hora?* 101. *Mesias* B. 102. *choraua sem* B. 103. *cospido* B.

& do spirito sancto, igual
Deos immortal,
conuidada, benza a vos
por seu amor.
Ygreja. ¶ Ora sus, venha agoa as mãos.

Agost. Vos aveysuos de lavar
em lagrymas da culpa vossa
& bem lauada
& aueisuos de chegar
alimpar
a hũa toalha fermosa
bem laurada
co sirgo das veas puras
da Virgem sem magoa nacido
& apurado,
torcido com amarguras
aas escuras,
com grande dor guarnecido
& acabado.
¶ Nam que os olhos alimpeis,
que a nam consentirão
os tristes laços
que taes pontos achareis
da face & enues,
que se rompe o coração
em pedaços.
Vereis*, triste, laurado
[com rosto de fermosura]*
natural,
com tormentos pespontado
e figurado,
Deos criador, em figura
de mortal.

¶ Esta toalha que aqui se falla he a varonica, a qual Sancto Agostinho tira dantre os bacios & a mostra à Alma, & a madre ygreja con os doutores lhe fazem adoração de joelhos, cantando Salue sancta facies, & acabando diz a madre ygreja.

¶ Venha a primeyra yguaria.

Gero. Esta yguaria primeyra
foy, senhora,
guisada sem alegria
em triste dia,
a crueldade cozinheyra
& matadora.
Gostala eis com salsa & sal
de choros de muyta dor,
porque os costados
do Messias diuinal,
sancto sem mal,

And of the Spirit holiest,
On thee our guest:
Spirit immortal, Father, Son,
The Three in One.
105 *Church.* Come now, bring water for the hands.
St Aug. But thou must wash in tear on tear
Shed for thy past sins' misery,
Most thoroughly,
And then to this fair towel here
Thou may'st draw near,
A towel that is kept for thee
Worked cunningly
106 With finest silk in painlessness
From out the Holy Virgin's veins
That issuèd,
Silk that was spun in bitterness
And dark distress,
And woven with increasing pains
And finishèd.
107 Yet never shall thine eyes be dried:
This pattern sad will ever make
Thy tears downflow,
Such stitches here on either side
Doth it provide
That one's very heart must break
To see such woe.
108 Presented here thou mayest see
With lovely face most natural
—And seeing weep—
Embroiderèd with agony,
O mystery!
God fashioned, who created all,
In human shape.

(*The towel here described is the veronica, which St Augustine takes from among the dishes and shows to the Soul, and the Mother Church and the Doctors adore it on their knees, singing* Salve sancta Facies, *and the Mother Church then says:*)

109 *Church.* Let the first viand be brought.
St Jerome. It was preparèd joylessly
On a sad day,
With no pleasure was it fraught,
With suffering bought,
And its cook was Cruelty,
Eager to slay.
110 With seasoning of tears and shame
Must this course by thee be eaten,
Sorrowfully,
Since the Messiah's holy frame,
Pure, free from blame,

105. *Vso aveysuos* B. *a limpar* A [but cf. 107. *alimpeis* (A)]. *alimpar* B. *A alimpar* C.
107. *de face* C. 108. *Vereis seu triste laurado Natural* A, B, C, D, E.
108. *Esta toalha de que* C. *Veronica* C. *a mostra* A. *amostra* B, C. *santa facias* B.

forão pollo vosso amor
açoutados.

¶ Esta yguaria em q̃ aqui se falla sam os açoutes, & em este passo os tirã dos bacios & os presentam a alma & todos de joelhos adoram cantãdo Aue flagellum, & despois diz Geronymo.

¶ Estoutro manjar segundo
he yguaria
que aueis de mastigar
em contemplar
a dor que o senhor do mundo
padecia
pera vos remediar.
foi hum tromento improuiso
que aos miolos lhe chegou
& consentio,
por remediar o siso
que a vosso siso faltou,
e pera ganhardes parayso
a sofrio.

¶ Esta yguaria segunda de que aqui se fala he a coroa de espinhos, e em este passo a tiram dos bacios & de joelhos os sanctos doutores cantam Aue corona espinearum, & acabando diz a madre ygreja.
Venha outra do teor.

Gero. Estoutro manjar terceyro
foy guisado
em tres lugares de dor,
a qual maior,
com a lenha do madeyro
mais prezado.
Comese com gram tristeza*
porque a virgem gloriosa
o vio guisar:
vio crauar com gram crueza
a sua riqueza
& sua perla preciosa
vio furar.

¶ E a este passo tira sancto Agostinho os crauos. & todos de joelhos os adorão, cantando Dulce lignum, dulcis clauus, & acabada a adoraçam diz o anjo à alma.

¶ Leixay ora esses arreos,
que estoutra nam se come assi
como cuydais:
pera as almas sam mui feos

Cruelly was scourged and beaten
For love of thee.

(*The viand so described consists of the scourge which at this stage is taken from the dishes and presented to the Soul and all kneel and adore, singing* Ave flagellum, *and Jerome then says:*)

111 *St Jerome.* This second viand of noble worth,
This delicacy,
Must be slowly eaten by thee
In contemplation
Of what the Lord of all the earth
In agony
Sufferèd for thy salvation.
112 This new torture suddenly
He allowed to reach His brain,
That so thy wit
And sense might be restored to thee,
That perished from thee utterly,
Yea that thou Paradise might'st gain
Endured He it.

(*This second viand so described is the crown of thorns, and at this stage they take it from the plates, and kneeling the holy Doctors sing* Ave corona spinarum *and afterwards the Mother Church says:*)

113 *Church.* Another bring in the same strain.
St Jerome. This third viand that is brought to thee
Was prepared thrice
In places three, in each with gain
Of subtler pain,
With the wood of the Holy Tree,
Wood of great price.
114 It must be eaten sorrowfully,
Since the Virgin glorious
Saw it garnished,
Her treasure nailèd cruelly
Then did she see,
And her pearl most precious
Pierced and tarnished.

(*At this station St Augustine brings the nails and all kneel and adore them singing* Dulce lignum, dulcis clavus, *and when the adoration is ended the Angel says to the Soul:*)

115 *Angel.* These trappings must thou lay aside
This new fare cannot, thou must know,
Be eaten thus:
By them are men's souls vilified

---

110. *em q̃ se falla* B. *açotes* B. *espiniarum* C. *acabado* B.
114. *gran* C. *tristura* A, B, C, D, E.
112. *tormento* C. *fala* A. *falla* B.
113. *theor* C. *clausos* B. *acabada a oração* C.

e sam meos
con que nam andam em si
os mortais.

¶ Despe a alma o vestido & joyas que lho imigo deu & diz Agostinho.

¶ Oo alma bem aconselhada,
que dais o seu a cujo he,
o da terra ha terra:
agora yreis despejada
polla estrada,
porque vencestes com fee
forte guerra.
Ygreja. ¶ Venha estoutra yguaria.

Gero. A quarta yguaria he tal,
tam esmerada,
de tam infinda valia
& contia
que na mente diuinal
foy guisada,
por mysterio preparada
no sacrario virginal
muy cuberta,
da diuindade cercada
& consagrada,
despois ao padre eternal
dada em oferta.

¶ Apresenta sam Geronymo à alma hum crucificio que tira dantre os pratos, & os doutores o adoram cantando Domine Jesu Christe, & acabando diz a alma.

¶ Cõ que forças, com q̃ spirito
te darey, triste, louuores
que sou nada,
vendote, Deos infinito,
tam afflito,
padecendo tu as dores
& eu culpada?

Como estaas tam quebrantado,
filho de Deos immortal!
quem te matou?
Senhor per cujo mandado
es justiçado
sendo Deos vniuersal
que nos criou?

Agost. ¶ A fruyta deste jantar,
que neste altar vos foy dado
com amor,
yremos todos buscar

And in their pride
Puffed up with overweening show
Presumptuous.

(*The Soul casts off the dress and jewels that the enemy gave her.*)

116 *St Augustine.* O Soul well counselled! well bestowed
To each what is of each by right,
And earth to earth:
Now shalt thou speed along thy road,
Free of this load,
Faring by faith from this stern fight
Victorious forth.
117 *Church.* To the last course I thee invite.
St Jerome. This fourth viand is of [a kind
So seasonèd,
It is of value infinite,
Most exquisite,
Prepared by the Divine mind
And perfected:
118 Entrusted first in mystery
To a holy virgin came from Heaven
This secret thing,
Encompassed by divinity
And sanctity,
Then to the Eternal Father given
As offering.

(*St Jerome presents to the soul a Crucifix, which he takes from among the dishes, and the Doctors adore it singing* Domine Jesu Christe, *and afterwards the Soul says*:)

119 *Soul.* With what heart and mind contrite
May I praise Thee sadly now
Who am nought,
Seeing Thee, God infinite,
To such plight
Of suffering and sorrow bow,
By my sin brought!
120 Lord how art Thou crushed and broken
Thou, the Son of God, to die!
And Thy death
By whom ordered, by what token
The word spoken
Thee to judge and crucify,
Who gav'st us breath?
121 *St Aug.* For the fruit to end this feast,
On the altar given thee thus
Lovingly,
To the orchard go we all in quest,

---

115. *inimigo* C. 116. *o seu a cujo he* A, B. *o seu cujo he* C, D.
118. *oferta* A. *offerta* B. *crucifixo* B, C.
119. *spirito* A, B. *sprito* C. *tristes louvores* C, D, E. *dios* B. 121. *fruta* B.

ao pomar
adonde estaa sepultado
o redemptor.

¶ E todos com a alma, cantando Te Deum laudamus, foram adorar ho muymento.

Where lies at rest
The Redeemer, He who died for us
And set us free.

(*And all with the Soul, singing* Te deum laudamus, *went to adore the tomb.*)

LAVS DEO.

NOTES.

The *Auto da Alma*, produced in 1508, which in some sense forms a Portuguese pendant to the *Recuerde el alma* of Jorge de Manrique (1440 ?–79), is a Passion play, corresponding to the modern *Stabat* on the eve of Good Friday. It was not, however, acted in a convent or church, but in the new riverside palace which saw so many splendid *serões* during King Manoel's reign (1495–1521). King Manoel had now been twelve and a half years on the throne and was in the full tide of prosperity. His sister, Queen Lianor or Eleanor (1458–1525), Gil Vicente's patroness, who so keenly encouraged Portuguese art and literature, was the widow (and first cousin) of his predecessor, King João II. The theme of the play, the contention of Angel and Devil for the possession of a human soul, was far from new. Its treatment, however, was original and the versification is clear-cut and well sustained throughout, while a glowing fervour raises the whole play to the loftiest heights. The metre is mostly in verses of seven short (8848484) lines (*abcaabc*) with an occasional slight variation. There is a French version of the play, presumably in verse, but the difficult task of translating it would require, to be successful, the delicate precision of a Théophile Gautier. In his hands it might have become in French a thing of beauty and a joy for ever, as it is in the original Portuguese. As to the text, without emulating the pedantry of the critic who added a fourth season to Shelley's three, and thereby provoked a splendid outburst of wrath from Swinburne, we may assume that in passages where Vicente appears to have gone out of his way to avoid a required rhyme, this is merely a case of corruption repeated in successive editions. Thus in the *Auto Pastoril Portugues*, where *Catalina minha dama* rhymes with *toucada* we may perhaps substitute *fada* for *dama*. So here verse 114 must read *tristeza*, not *tristura*, to rhyme with *crueza*. In 3 one of the *mantimentos* should perhaps be *alimentos* (cf. the two *vaydades* in 14); in 26 *fortunas* should probably read *farturas* (cf. *essas farturas* in the *Dialogo sobre a Ressureiçam*); in 35 the words *mui fermosos*, or a single longer word, have evidently dropped out; in 54 *tendes* was perhaps an alteration by some critic who did not realize that the Angel might naturally associate itself with the Church and say *temos*: 'we provide'; the last line of 100 was perhaps the word *pecadora*; in 108 also a line is missing and a rhyme required for *figura* (*lavrado* must go with *Deos*, *triste* with *vereis*, omitting *seu*). On the other hand it is hardly necessary to alter 42 or 45 (although here *esmaltado* is in the air) or 46 so as to make them exactly fit the metre.

1 *perigos dos imigos* cf. *Os Trabalhos de Jesus* 1665 ed. p. 94: *o caminho do Ceo he cercado de inimigos e perigos para o perder. qualibus in tenebris vitae quantisque periclis Degitur hoc aevi quodcumque est!*

7–10 These exquisite verses have something of the scent and perfection of wild flowers, and that mystic rapture which is not to be found in Goethe's more worldly *Faust*. We may, if we like, call the *Auto da Alma* (as also the witch-scene in the *Auto das Fadas*) a 16th century *Faust*, but really no parallel can be drawn between the two plays. The ethereal beauty of Vicente's lyrical *auto*, carved in delicate ivory, is far less varied and human: it has scarcely a touch of the cynicism and not a touch of the coarseness of Goethe's splendid work cast in bronze. It can be compared at most with such lyrical passages as *Christ ist erstanden* or *Ach neige, Du*

121. *a onde* C. *redemptor* B. *moymento* B. *moimento* C.

Schmerzenreiche, Dein Antlitz gnädig meiner Not, and as a whole is a mere lily of the valley by the side of a purple hyacinth.

9 *Planta sois e caminheira.* Cf. the white-flowered 'wayfaring tree.'

18 *porá grosa*, attack, criticize, gloss. (=*glosar.* Cf. the modern 'to grouse.')

30 Cf. Dante, *Inf.* II. *Dunque che è? perchè, perchè, ristai?*

35 The *chapim* was rather a high-heeled shoe than a slipper.

38 *marcante.* In the *Auto da Feira* the Devil is similarly a *bufarinheiro* (pedlar).

43 *A for da corte. For=foro* (v. Gonçalvez Viana, *Apostilas*, vol. I. p. 353).

58 Cf. Plato *Respublica*, 365, ἀδικητέον καὶ θυτέον ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδικημάτων, κ.τ.λ. Vicente in his plays often inculcates the need of something more than a formal religion.

58 *xiquer.* Cf. *Auto da Barca do Inferno: Isto hi xiquer irá.*

59–60 These two verses are in the true spirit of Goethe's Mephistopheles.

62 *esta peçonha.* Would Vicente have written thus (cf. 66) of the soul had there been the slightest gossip or suspicion that his patroness, Queen Lianor, had poisoned her husband? (See the most interesting studies in *Critica e Historia.* Por Anselmo Braamcamp Freire, vol. I. Lisbon, 1910.)

67 *abstinada.* In the *Barca do Purgatorio* and the *Auto da Cananea*: *austinada.*

73 *day passada=perdoai, dai licença.* Cf. Jorge Ferreira de Vasconcellos, *Eufrosina* II, 5. 1616 ed. f. 79 v.

77 In Basque *pastorales* one of the main attributes of the devils and the wicked is that they are never quiet on the stage. In the *Auto da Cananea* (1534), a play in many ways resembling the *Auto da Alma*, the line *Como andas desosegado* recurs, addressed by Belzebu to Satanas.

80 Cf. Anador Arraez *Dialogos.* No. 1. 1604 ed. f. lv.: *S. Jeronimo diz que é grande o reino, potencia e alçada das lagrimas...atormentam mais aos Demonios que a pena infernal.*

95 Cf. Antonio Feo, *Trattados Quadragesimais* (1609), II, f. 23: *assy na Cruz como no monte Olíueto chorou porque vio vir a quem ouuera de chorar.*

116 *dais o seu a cujo é*, cf. *Triunfo do Inverno*: *Porque se devem de dar As cousas a cujas são.*

AUBREY F. G. BELL.

S. JOÃO DO ESTORIL, PORTUGAL.

A HITHERTO UNIDENTIFIED SOURCE OF HUYGENS' SATIRE, ''T KOSTELICK MAL.'

THE Dutch poet Constantijn Huygens paid his third visit to England in the latter part of 1621, and resided there, in London and its neighbourhood, from December 7 of that year till the beginning of February 1623. During the earlier months of his sojourn he was occupied, in the intervals and delays of diplomatic business, with the composition of his satire, *'t Kostelick Mal,* a rambling but at times sufficiently incisive commentary on the extravagance of contemporary fashion. For this, says Leendertz[1], 'he made serious studies. When he had once decided to write a satire upon fashion, he began to study the subject systematically. The first thing he did was what we also should do: he took up his encyclopaedia. But it was still the beginning of the 17th century. Although Kepler's chief work and various writings of Galilei and of Bacon had already appeared, science for the most part continued to follow her old way. Only with a second generation of students of nature, among whom Constantijn's son was to take a place of honour, was a wider sphere to be found for speculation and scientific research. The *Florilegium Magnum, sive Polyanthea* of Jos. Langius contained, therefore, no thorough treatment of the subjects taken up in it, but merely a great collection of quotations out of all kinds of writers, arranged in certain groups.

'The quotations from Langius which he intended to make use of were written by Huygens on the back of the sheet of paper on which he began the poem. [Many of these, as Leendertz shows, are taken simply from the article *Vestis* in this compilation.]... He also read, before commencing the poem, an English book by a certain *Williams,* the title of which I have not been able to discover. That he made use of the Bible also, goes almost without saying, but that he read this in English is worth remarking. Perhaps, too, among these preliminary studies,...we should include parts of Juvenal: from the latter he draws at least several quotations, only one of which I have been able to discover in Langius.'

---

[1] *Nederlandsche Klassieken,* III. *Constantyn Huygens' Kostelick Mal en Voor-hout. Derde druk, bezorgd door Dr. P. Leendertz Jr. Amsterdam,* 1904. A. Versluys. Inleiding, pp. xxiv–xxv.

The 'English book' which Leendertz failed to identify, but to which Huygens' debt is rendered certain by the quotations included among the memoranda for his poem, was: 'A | Sermon | of | Apparell[1], Preached before the Kings Ma|iestie and the Prince | his Highnesse at *Theobalds*, the 22. of February, | 1619 By Iohn Williams[2], Dr. in Diuinitie, Deane | of Salisbury, and one of his Maiesties | Chaplaines then in Attendance. Published by his Maiesties | especiall Commandement. | (Device) | London, | Printed by Iohn Bill, Printer | to the Kings most Excellent | Maiestie. | M. DC. XX.' [pp. 1–32]

There is evidence that not only the text but also the copious marginal references of this sermon provided Huygens with material and learned ornament for his poem. It is even possible that from it may have come part of the original suggestion of his satire, which, as Leendertz admits (Inleiding, p. xiii), seems to have been inspired in the first instance more by the conditions of London life than by those at The Hague[3].

Huygens' citations from Williams number seven in all (Leendertz, pp. 145, 154, 155 and 157), but only in four of these is the author mentioned by name ('Williams,' 'Will.').

(i) The first occurs among the notes on Langius (Leendertz, Appendix A. hh.): 'Quantum mali proxime hac inseras, vid. Williams, pag. 19, 20 et seq.' The reference here is to an amusing passage in which the preacher descants on the evil influence of fine clothes in church. 'When thou comest thus rigged to the house of God, (for that's now adaies the *Theater* of all this vanitie) *velut gladium te & venenum videntibus praebes* (saith S. *Cyprian*) thou art no better then poyson in the veines, and a sword in the heart of all thy brethren. Thy colours glitter in their rowling *eyes*, when they should bee *reading*. Thy silkes doe rattle in their itching *eares*, when they should be hearing. Thy fashions swim in their idle *braines*, when they should be thinking. And thou takest vp all the powers of their soules, when they should be *praying*.... Lastly, suppose the people were so attentiue, as not to regard this vanity of *Men*, what flesh and blood hath his thoughts so staunch, but must be distracted in his Church-deuotions, at the *prodigious* apparition of our

---

[1] On Matthew 11, verse 8.

[2] Afterwards Bishop of Lincoln and Archbishop of York.

[3] He may have acquired a copy of the sermon during his second visit to London, Jan.–April 1621. *'t Kostelick Mal* was begun 24 Dec. 1621, soon after his return to England, and completed 8 March 1622.

women? Monstrum à monstrando (say the Grammarians) monsters are therefore so termed, because men cannot for their hearts, but runne *out to see them...*'

The remaining passages (Leendertz, Appendix B) are all found among the miscellaneous quotations, from the classics, Scripture, the Church fathers, etc., jotted down by Huygens on three loose sheets of paper in preparation for the writing of his satire. A certain number of these quotations also occur in the marginal commentary of Williams, who was probably equally dependent in his turn on some such book of reference as Langius; but for the present we may confine ourselves to direct citations from the text of the Sermon.

(ii) Leendertz, p. 154: App. B. 98. 'Nochtans is 't redelijck groot van cleyn te onderscheyden, for to defend us from injuries of the airs and men. vid. Will. cpt [? opt. *v. infra* (v)] 25.' On page 25, in a passage of strained ingenuity, Williams develops the idea that clothes have a double end to serve. 'For indeed vpon the fall of *Adam*, cloathes were inuented, not for one, but (as *Pererius* well obserues) for many purposes. Because in the state of grace, as we were not obnoxious to the iniuries of the *Ayre*, wetting, nipping, and scorching: no more we were (beeing all of vs equall) to the iniuries of men. All which iniuries of men *Aristotle* in his *Rhetorickes* gathers to one head, to wit *Paruipensionem*, slighting or contemning. And therefore in the state of sinne, *Cloathes* as they presently defended vs from *one*, so (by the light of reason remayning in man, like a little blessing in a dead Elme) they were drawne in time to protect vs from the *other*...' Cf. *Kostelick Mal*, ll. 456 et seq.

(iii) Ib. p. 154: App. B. 103. 'This is the strangest humor of all that when God hath made man simply the best he will needes make himself the meanest of the nature' [*sic*]. No author's name given, but from Williams, p. 17: for 'nature' read: creatures. The passage is expanded in Huygens' lines, *Kostelick Mal*, 185–189.

Het opper-schepsel mensch, het wonderlickste wonder
Van die den hemel deckt, daer voor, daer om, daer onder,
Al dat leeft leven heeft, daelt van dien hoogen trap,
Duyckt onder 't wolle warm van een' gevilden lap,
Verçiert sich met den buyt van een' gestolen' pis-ziel, etc.

(iv) Ib. p. 154: App. B. 109. 'To see a man to have a farme clapt upon his feete, a coppy holde dangling up and down his legges, a mannor wrapt about his body, a Lordship hanging upon his shoulders, nay (per adventure) the tythes (Christ's patrymonie) twind to a cap, and the bread of the poore to a plume of feathers.' Again without ascription, but from

Williams, p. 18: for 'twind' read: turn'd. According to Leendertz, the influence of this passage is to be traced in ll. 277–80 of *'t Kostelick Mal*:

Die uyt het Oorgewicht van uw' gereckte lellen,
Dry Renten, eenen Koop, vier Hueren sagh te tellen:
Die met het ringh-geraes dat uwe hand begraeft,
Sijn uyt-gequijlt gesin van spinnen saegh onslaeft?

(v) Ib. p. 155: App. B. 119. 'Cloathes must not only defend us from injuries of the aire but also of men. Vid. Will. optime 25.' Cf. no. (ii).

(vi) Ib. p. 155: App. B. 122. 'Propter simplices, qui aliter non cognoscunt dignitatem divini ministerii. Abul. n. 1. in Math. 11. Vid. plures locos Will. 25.'

Connected, apparently, with Williams' remark (*loc. cit.*) that 'They [fine clothes, i.e.] are not for every *sole* and priuate man, to gather about him a gaping multitude, but for *Magistrates* and other *remarkeable* persons, employed in governing Estates, and seruing of Kings.' Cf. Huygens' preceding note (121 in Leendertz, App. B): 'Regibus et manentibus in domo Regum, conveniunt vestes pretiosiores. Idem est de praelatis et caeteris Clericis, quibus etc. pag. 28.' Both these last quotations (121, 122) occur also in the marginal notes to Williams, besides being glossed and amplified in the text. The pertinent passage in *'t Kostelick Mal* is most likely that from l. 456 onwards:

Wie sal een' Volcker-vorst, soo veler hoofden hoofd,
Of 't kraeckende geblick van door-gegoude zijden,
Of 't flickerend behangh van steenen schat besnijden?
Wie kan hem op de leest van alle man beslaen?
etc.

(vii) Ib. p. 157: App. B. 149. 'Pride so farre transporteth a private man that the Indians (the remotest people of the world) must be continually busied to tricke up and trimme him in spinning of their trees for silke to apparell him, in diving to their seas for pearls to adorne him, in picking their rockes for diamonds to sparkle him, in digging in their venter for gold to lace him, in hunting their vermins for smels to fume him.' From Williams, pp. 15–16, but without mention of the source. There are some variations from the original, which runs: 'A strange humor in so reasonable a creature: That whereas (as *Musonius* was wont to say) there is no more vse of a vestment, then an Armour to *protect* vs:...yet pride should so farre transport a priuate man...' etc. For 'venter' read: Center, and for 'vermins': vermin. The passage is recalled in ll. 173–8 of Huygens' satire:

Hoe maecken 't onse tijden?
Gebreckt ons decksel stof, daar moet de Turck voor lijden,

De Persch, den Indiaen, en al dat spinnen kan ;
Heel Vlack-Italien beslommert Vrouw en Man,
Ontlommert Wijn en Terw, ont-bladert struyck en boomen,
Om 't ydel altijd-nieuw van ons' versierde zoomen.

It may be noted in conclusion that Huygens' library, which was catalogued and sold after his death[1], contained a most remarkable and representative collection of English books, principally of the 17th century (the first folio Shakespeare, the Chaucer of 1598, the 1617 edition of the *Faerie Queene,* Bacon's *Essays* and *Natural History*, Browne's *Religio Medici,* Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1628), works by Quarles, Herbert, Donne[2], Killigrew, Jonson, Waller, Cowley, Davenant, Cartwright, Shirley, Randolph, Carew and others, besides an abundant store of theology and history); but he does not seem to have preserved his copy of Williams' Sermon. The British Museum possesses two examples of the work.

JOHN PURVES.

LONDON.

---

[1] *Catalogus der Bibliotheek van Constantyn Huygens verkocht op de groote zaal van het hof te 's-Gravenhage* 1688. *Opnieuw Uitgegeven naar het eenig overgebleven Exemplaar.* 's-Gravenhage. W. P. van Stockum & Zoon. 1903.

[2] Huygens, it may be recalled, translated into Dutch a group of Donne's lyrics, and evidently plumed himself upon the achievement, which created something of a flutter in his circle. 'Stupeo ad autorem,' wrote Barlaeus, 'stupeo ad interpretem.' These translations, which have been ingeniously used by Mr Grierson to support his textual work on the English originals, must be counted among the earliest and most venturesome renderings into any foreign vernacular of the work of our older poets.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

Notes on Anglo-Saxon Charters etc.

I. *Bishop Denewulf.*

In Thorpe's *Diplomatarium Anglicum* p. 162 (Kemble v, 166, Birch II 282), in a charter of Bishop Denewulf from Codex Wintoniensis (Add MS. 15350) f. 96b, occurs this sentence: 'Ond ic ða (MS. ð*u*) sælf þæt ierfæ togestrindæ, þæt ðær mon siððun *bi wæs*,' which Thorpe renders: 'And I myself then provided the cattle, and there people were afterwards.'

The N.E.D., s.v. *bewiste*, has: '*bī-wist* is the sb. answering to a vb. **bi-wesan*.' I suggest that we have here an apparently solitary occurrence of this verb, whose place, for greater clearness, was taken by *bīlibban*, of which Bosworth-Toller Supp., s.v. *be*, gives several examples; one is: 'þæt yrfe þe wē big leofiaþ.' A.S. *bīwist* = *bīleofa* = sustenance, food. I would translate then: 'I myself provided the cattle, so that one afterwards lived thereon,' or, 'on which one afterwards lived there.'

II. *King Alfred's Will.*

(Kemble II, 112, Thorpe 484, Birch II, 176, Earle 144, Harmer 15.)

There is more than one passage in this famous document on which further light is needed. One of them is the sentence beginning Thorpe 485, l. 10, Harmer 16. 12: *Þa sæde he me þæt he naht eaðe ne mihte todælan forþon he hæfde ful oft ær ongefangen.* Miss Harmer's note states the difficulty clearly:

> The meaning of this sentence is not clear. It may simply refer to the difficulty of making a fair division of the estates, in which case *forþon he hæfde ful oft ær ongefangen* may be translated 'for he had already many times attempted to do so.'... This interpretation of the passage raises the difficulty that although *onfon* does sometimes mean 'to try, undertake,' it occurs only with a noun object. Its most usual meaning is 'to take, receive.' If that is its meaning here, the sentence must be translated 'since he had often received additions to it.'

The difficulty has arisen, I believe, entirely through the editors taking *on gefangen* as one word instead of two. It is in reality the pp. of *fōn on* (not of *onfōn*), of which B.-T. Supp. gives two parallel instances from the Laws: *fōn hī ealle on,* 'let them all set to work,' and *fō hē on mid fultume.* The pp. of *onfōn* appears to be always *onfangen.* The meaning then is: 'Then he said to me that he could not easily make a division, for he had already attempted it full often.'

III. *The Stolen Belt.*

(Kemble II, 133, Thorpe 169, Birch II, 236, Earle 162, Harmer 30.)

This intensely interesting document, to which my attention was first drawn by Dr Henry Bradley, has an annoying double hiatus due to a hole in the MS. The sentence runs: *ond cwæð ðæt him wære leofre ðæt he......alde ðonne se að forburste oððe hit æfr......æde.* In each gap there is room for about a dozen letters. The first lacuna has been successfully filled up, I think by Earle. I venture to fill up the second in the hope that someone will do it better, as I am sure is possible: *ond cwæð ðæt him wære leofre ðæt he [ðæt land me se]alde ðonne se að forburste oððe hit æfr[e mon unriht s]æde.*

ALFRED J. WYATT.

CAMBRIDGE.

'A WONDERFULL PROGNOSTICATION' (1591).

A Wonderfull, strange and miraculous, Astrologicall Prognostication (1591) is well known to bibliographers as a work attributed without evidence to the pen of Thomas Nashe. It was one of a group of three pamphlets belonging to the same year[1], all issued in ridicule of contemporary almanac-makers—'they that lie all the year long.' The existence of a second edition of *A Wonderfull...Prognostication* has escaped the notice of bibliographers. This is not surprising, as the only known copy was entered in the Bodleian Catalogue under 'Astrologia[2].' The copy is unfortunately imperfect, lacking all after sig. D_1. It is curious that a second edition of such an ephemeral publication should have been found necessary. There may have been more point in the satire than is now apparent. The title-page is as follows[3]:

☞ A Wonderfull, | *strange and miraculous Astro-* | logicall Prognostication for | this yeere 1591. | . . . . | *Newly corrected.* | By Adam Fouleweather, Student | in Astronomy. | [ornament as in A] | Imprinted at London by *Thomas* | *Scarlet.*

---

[1] Cf. *Works of Thomas Nashe* (ed. R. B. McKerrow), IV, 476.

[2] The shelf-mark is G. Pamph. 2156.

[3] Words omitted are the same in both editions.

Some of the more obvious literal errors of the first edition (A) are corrected in the second (B), but others are permitted to remain. The chief difference between the two editions is in the paragraph arrangement. In B there are 84 paragraphs to the end of sig. D_1^v: in A the same matter is divided into 17. The compositor of B compensates for the additional space required for this division by closer printing, by a freer use of contractions, by changes in spelling, and by the omission of unimportant words[1]. The collation is the same as that given for A by Dr McKerrow[2], except that the Bodleian copy lacks all after sig. D_1, that the B of sig. B_3 is turned, and that the catch-word on sig. D_1 is 'The'[3]. Sig. D_1^v ends with the following line[4]: 'diuerse Bakers and the pillorie, for making'. The catch-word is 'theyr'.

F. P. WILSON.

OXFORD.

SHAKESPEARE, 'LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST,' IV, i, 105.

Here, sweet, put up this, 'twill be thine another day.

P. A. Daniel, in the *Athenæum*, 13 Oct. 1883, explains the words ''twill be thine another day[5]' to mean 'it will be of use to you; you will find the *benefit* of it hereafter.' This explanation Daniel derived from a number of examples of this expression found in the works of Shakespeare's contemporaries[6]. But this meaning, as Daniel noted, gives rise to an expectation with regard to a future use of Armado's letter that is not fulfilled. The putting up, or pocketing, of Armado's letter, in other words, results in no benefit to Rosaline at another time, contrary to the Princess's statement. H. C. Hart, to avoid this difficulty, gives to this expression the meaning of 'it will be your *turn* another day.'

Daniel, and not Hart, however, is right. Daniel's interpretation is correct, as proven by other examples of this expression which I have found, all having the meaning given it by Daniel. These examples I give in a foot-note[1]. The difficulty noted by Daniel in connection with this meaning still remains to be dealt with. However, it disappears upon a re-examination of the meaning of the three words, 'put up this,' immediately preceding the words ''twill be thine another day.' Here the literal meaning of 'put up,' which has been accepted as the correct meaning, must be replaced by the figurative and now obsolete meaning of these words, 'put up with[2].' With this interpretation the line would then have the meaning, 'Here, sweet, put up *with* this (i.e. Costard's mistake in substituting Armado's for Biron's letter), and it will be for your good later on[3].' In other words the Princess urges a temporary control on Rosaline's part for her future benefit.

---

[1] So 'Venus beeing congregated' (III, 389. 3) becomes 'Venus cōgregated', 'shall be counted as' (393. 7) becomes 'shal be as'. The compositor of B resolutely ignores the pun in 'Student in Asse-tronomy', and prints 'Astronomy' or 'Astrology' consistently, both on the title-page and elsewhere.

[2] III, 377.

[3] Sig. D_1^v begins 'The knightes of...' (cf. III, 393. 2).

[4] Cf. III, 393. 20–21.

[5] This expression does not occur again in Shakespeare.

[6] The value of Daniel's explanation has not been generally recognized. Furness and Hart (Dowden text edition) refer to Daniel's note, but do not give it their approval. See *New Variorum* edition of *L.L.L.*, Furness, p. 125 note, for the four examples given by Daniel to substantiate his interpretation, and for Furness' comment upon this interpretation.

In this connection it is of importance to observe that the Princess prophesies correctly that it will be to Rosaline's profit if she does not resent Costard's mistake. We know that the Princess prophesies correctly, since we learn later on that it is through Costard's confusion of Armado's and Biron's letters that Biron's love for Rosaline is revealed to his fellow-students[4], with the result that Biron and his companions speedily resolve 'to woo these girls of France and win them too.' The difficulty, then, that Daniel found in this line of a benefit promised but unrealized ceases to exist when we understand that the Princess's words direct not that Rosaline put up this letter, but that she put up *with* Costard's bungling mistake, a mistake from which Rosaline is to, and does, profit later on.

M. P. TILLEY.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

---

[1] The following examples offer a clearer, less condensed form of the expression in question: *Nice Wanton* (Manly's *Specimens of the Pre-Shakespearean Drama*, Vol. I, 479, line 544): 'Applye your learnyng and your elders obey: *It will be your profit another day.*' *Wit of a Woman* (*Malone Society Edition*, I, 1098): 'But I have a secret to tell you, that if you will conceal and follow my counsaile, *it will bee for your good another day.*' From other examples—than those quoted by Daniel—of ''twill be thine another day,' the meaning given these words by him is confirmed. These examples are the more worth recording since I cannot find that ''twill be thine another day' has been noticed in *The New English Dictionary*, *Shakespeare Dictionary* by Onions, or Schmidt's *Shakespeare Lexicon*. The latest example that I have found of this expression, now obsolete, is in Shadwell's *True Widow*, 1672 (1720 edition, III, 157): 'Youth is indiscreet and unwary; trust us, and *'twill be your own another day*: I say, Mr Stanmore will settle ten times more upon you than the other is worth.' An earlier example is found in *Somebody and Nobody* (Farmer Facsimile, E2): 'Thus you minx Ile teach you ply your worke, and thanke me to, This paines *will be your owne another day.*' To four other examples I called attention in *Notes and Queries*, 11 S. VII, 7 and 11 S. I, 164.

[2] Shakespeare uses this meaning of 'put up,' common to his day (see N.E.D.), in two other plays: *Oth.* IV, ii, 181; and *Tit. And.* I, i, 433.

[3] It is likely, also, that another pun here is added to the hundred or so puns in the play.

[4] This is effected through Jaquetta's carrying Biron's letter to Holofernes, who sends it as containing treason to the Duke.

THE SOURCES OF CARLYLE'S LECTURE ON 'THE HERO AS DIVINITY.'

Whenever Carlyle speaks of Scandinavian mythology, he displays a much truer appreciation of the old Norse spirit than most of his predecessors. He came much nearer to understanding the thoughts and feelings of the old Norsemen than did either Gray or Walpole. Yet like them he was unable to go direct to the original and had to rely on translations as a medium.

At the time when he delivered his lecture on *The Hero as Divinity* (May 5th, 1840), neither Dasent's translation of the *Prose Edda* nor Laing's version of the *Heimskringla* was published, the former appearing in 1842 and the latter in 1844. Carlyle was therefore obliged to rely on other sources. The chief of these seem to be (1) Jakob Grimm's *Deutsche Mythologie* which had been published at Göttingen in 1835; (2) *Der Mythus von Thôr nach nordischen Quellen*, by Ludwig Uhland, which appeared at Stuttgart and Augsburg in 1836; (3) Paul Henri Mallet's *Northern Antiquities*, whether the London edition of 1770 or the Edinburgh reprint of 1809, it is impossible to say.

In two places Grimm is referred to by name. 'Grimm, the German Antiquary,' says Carlyle, 'goes so far as to deny that any man Odin ever existed.' The passage corresponding to the account which Carlyle then proceeds to give will be found in the *Deutsche Mythologie*, p. 94, and runs as follows:

> Die höchste und oberste gottheit, wie man annehmen darf, allgemein unter allen deutschen stämmen verehrt, würde in gothischer mundart geheissen haben *Vôdans* oder *Vôthans*, sie hiess ahd. Wuotan...Unzweifelhaft ist wol die unmittelbare abkunft dieses wortes aus dem verbum ahd. *watan*, *wuot*, altn. *vadha*, *ódh*, welches buchstäblich dem lat. *vadere* entspricht, und *meare*, *transmeare* bedeutet, *cum impetu ferri*, ebendaher stammt das subst. *wuot*, das, wie *μένος* und *animus* eigentlich *mens*, *ingenium*, dann ungestüm und wildheit ausdrückt; im altn. *ôdhr* haftet noch ganz die bedeutung *mens* oder *sensus*. Hiernach scheint Wuotan, Odhinn das allmächtige, alldurchdringende wesen, *qui omnia permeat*; wie Lucan von Jupiter sagt: *est quodcunque vides, quocunque moveris*, die geistige gottheit.

It will be noted that when Carlyle declares that *Wuotan* is the original form of *Odin*, he is attributing a statement to Grimm which the latter did not make and never could have made.

In another passage of his lecture Carlyle says that 'perhaps the notablest god we hear tell-of is one of whom Grimm the German etymologist finds trace: the God *Wünsch* (*sic*!), or Wish.' This probably refers to the account given on pp. 99—100 of the *Deutsche Mythologie*.

> Den inbegriff von heil und seligkeit, die erfüllung aller gaben, scheint die alte sprache mit einem einzigen worte, dessen bedeutung sich nachher verengerte, auszudrücken, es hiess der wunsch...Unter den eddischen namen Odhins kommt nun

auch vor Osci...d. h. der die menschen des wunsches, der höchsten gabe theilhaftig machende.

From this it appears then that the power to fulfil wishes was in the older period an attribute of Odin and not that of a special god. There is therefore no justification here for Carlyle's setting up a god Wish alongside Thor and Balder.

When speaking of the survival of the name of Odin in present-day names, Carlyle says: 'Our own Wednesday...is it not still Odin's day? Wednesbury, Wansborough, Wanstead, Wandsworth.' He doubtless obtained a hint from Grimm, who on p. 89 of the *Deutsche Mythologie* points out that the fourth day of the week is named after Odin. On p. 103 Grimm says:

> Ein Vôdnes beorg in der ags. chronik...woraus nachher Wodnesborough, Wansborough (in Wiltshire) gemacht wurde;

and on p. 107 we are told:

> In England erscheinen mehrere [Ortsbenennungen]: Woodnesboro in Kent, unweit Sandwich; Wednesbury in Staffordshire; Wednesfield ebenda; Wednesham in Cheshire, Wodnesfield bei Ethelwerd...und wol noch andere.

Carlyle seems to have made a selection here and to have added Wanstead and Wandsworth as being of special interest to the London audience he was addressing.

Elsewhere Carlyle informed his hearers that '*Hynde Etin*, and still more decisively *Red Etin of Ireland*, in the Scottish Ballads, these are both derived from Norseland.' This remark was no doubt suggested by the following statement in the *Deutsche Mythologie*, pp. 302–3:

> Auch in Schottland kannte man die erzählung 'of the reyde eytyn vitht the thre heydis,' vom rothen riesen mit den drei häuptern (complaynt p. 98) und Lindsays dreme (ed. 1592, p. 225) gedenken der 'history of reid etin.'

Another passage in which Carlyle seems to have gleaned information from Grimm, though he applies it wrongly, occurs in his description of the old giants. '*Frost*,' he says, 'the old Norse Seer discerns to be a monstrous hoary Jötun, the Giant *Thrym, Hrym*; or *Rime*, the old word now nearly obsolete here, but still used in Scotland to signify hoar-frost.' We see that the name Thrym, which Uhland had declared to mean 'uproar,' and which has since been explained as signifying 'exhausted' or 'powerless,' is here connected with the word 'rime.' This suggestion, which appears to be Carlyle's own and lacks all foundation, probably owes its origin to a few lines in Grimm about the giant Ymir. Of the latter he says, *Deutsche Mythologie*, p. 305:

> Ymir selbst entsprang aus gefrornem reif oder thau (hrîm)...davon heissen alle riesen *hrîmthursar*, reifriesen; *hrîmkaldr* (reifkalt) ist beiwort für *iötunn* oder *thurs*...; Hrîmnir, Hrîmgrîmr, Hrîmgerdhr sind riesische eigennamen.

Direct reference is made to Uhland towards the end of the lecture, where Carlyle mentions him with evident approval. 'Is it not a trait of right honest strength, says Uhland...that the old Norse heart finds its friend in the Thunder-God?' This corresponds to the following lines in *Der Mythus von Thôr*, p. 128 (*Uhlands Schriften*, Stuttgart, 1868):

> Ein Volk zeigt rüstigen Sinn, das im Donnerhalle die Nähe seines Freundes erkennt.

Carlyle's account of Thialfi is clearly based on Uhland, p. 19:

> Dienstpflichtige Gefährten Thôrs sind Thiâlfi und Röskva, der Arbeiter und die Rasche, Kinder eines Bauers; sie bezeichnen die unverdrossene menschliche Arbeit beim Anbau der Erde.

The brief narrative of Thor's visit to Hymir, which immediately follows the account of Thialfi, is also in all probability derived from Uhland's *Mythus von Thôr*, pp. 88—90. Carlyle describes how Thor places Hymir's cauldron over his head and proceeds to quote the words —the 'handles of it reach down to his heels.' With this may be compared Uhland's:

> An die Fersen schlagen ihm die Hebringe (*loc. cit.* p. 89).

At the end of this passage in the lecture we read: 'This is the Hymir whose cattle, the critics have discovered, are Icebergs.' In spite of the words 'icebergs' instead of 'glaciers,' these lines evidently refer to Uhland (*loc. cit.* pp. 91—92), who says:

> Wenn mit der Rinderheerde des Sturmgebirgriesen Thrym das Gewölke gemeint war, so sind unter denjenigen des Eisriesen Hŷmir die wandelnden Gletscher zu verstehen.

At the close of the description of Thor's expedition to Utgard, of his attendant Skrymir and of the god's adventure with the gigantic glove, Carlyle gives an explanation, 'Thor looked at his attendant Jötun: it was Skrymir;—it was, say Norse critics, the old chaotic rocky *Earth* in person, and that glove-*house* was some Earth-cavern.' The Norse critics are not, as one might think, Scandinavian critics, but students of Old Norse, and the reference is to Uhland (*loc. cit.* p. 43):

> Der Riesenhandschuh, darin sie übernachten, ist eine Steinkluft mit ihrer Nebenhöhle.

Mention must likewise be made of the concluding paragraphs in *The Hero as Divinity* where the apparition of Thor to King Olaf is described. Carlyle would seem to have read with profit Uhland's account in *Der Mythus von Thôr* (p. 25).

The extent of Carlyle's indebtedness to Mallet is less easy to determine. The fact that he refers to the theory of Torfæus that Odin came to the North in the year 70 B.C. appears to point to familiarity with Mallet, and this is perhaps confirmed by the account of Odin as the inventor of the runes. Such forms as Loke and Hela are identical with those found in Mallet, though it is hardly safe to press this argument too far. It also seems probable, though absolute proof is almost impossible, that Carlyle's accounts of Balder's death, of the creation of the world, of the cow Adumbla and the great ash Ygdrasil are based on the extracts from the Edda given in the second volume of Mallet.

One fact emerges clearly from a study of the sources of the lecture on *The Hero as Divinity*, namely, that Carlyle was no mere plagiarist, nor a mouthpiece for the views of others. As Professor J. G. Robertson has said: 'Carlyle is not to be regarded as a mere apostle or transmitter of German ideas and German ideals.' Nowhere is the constructive aspect of Carlyle's genius better revealed than in the first lecture of *Heroes and Hero-Worship*. What he owed to Grimm and also to the Swiss Mallet was chiefly facts. To Uhland and his naturalistic explanation of old Norse mythology, his debt was greater. But Carlyle's perception of 'the robust simplicity, the veracity, the directness of conception' of the old Norse spirit, and his interpretation of Norse mythology in this light—this is entirely his own. Carlyle was willing to learn from Grimm and Uhland, but he is no mere apprentice. At times he lays violent hands on their opinions and uses them for his own ends. Always he shows himself to be an original master-builder.

HERBERT WRIGHT.

BANGOR.

THE SOURCE OF MATTHEW ARNOLD'S 'FORSAKEN MERMAN.'

The story of the merman who marries a maiden and is afterwards abandoned by her is one that has enjoyed considerable popularity in several countries. In Denmark it appears, though not until a comparatively late date, in the ballad *Agnete og Havmanden* which was a source of inspiration to the Danish poets Oehlenschläger and Baggesen. In his edition of the Danish ballads, Svend Grundtvig traced numerous German and Slavonic versions, though he was unable to discover a Swedish or Norwegian form. He therefore concluded that the Danish ballad was an importation from the south[1].

---

[1] *Danmarks gamle Folkeviser*, II, 48–51.

The question arises as to the source which gave Matthew Arnold the story on which *The Forsaken Merman* is based. Bearing in mind Arnold's knowledge of German, we might be inclined to think that he was familiar with one or other of the German versions. In the latter, however, the name of the merman's bride appears as Hannele, Annerle, Agnese, Agnete or Angnina, none of which would seem to suggest Arnold's Margaret. For this and other reasons, which we shall shortly discuss, we must look to Denmark as the ultimate source of the legend which Arnold dealt with.

It is perhaps surprising that Matthew Arnold should have published his poem without giving any indication that it was not an entirely original work, and, as far as I am aware, none of his editors have rectified the omission. The late Mr Macaulay, for example, in his excellent selection of Arnold's poems has nothing to say on the matter.

Mr Clement Shorter takes us a step further in his biography of George Borrow, where he contrasts the poetical quality of *The Forsaken Merman* with that of a ballad by Borrow entitled *The Deceived Merman*[1]. This poem, which appeared in *Romantic Ballads* (pp. 120–23) in 1826, is a translation of the Danish ballad of *Agnete og Havmanden.* It runs as follows:

Fair Agnes alone on the sea-shore stood,
Then rose a Merman from out the flood:

'Now, Agnes, hear what I say to thee,
Wilt thou my leman consent to be?'

'O, freely that will I become,
If thou but take me beneath the foam.'

He stopp'd her ears, and he stopp'd her eyes,
And into the ocean he took his prize.

The Merman's leman was Agnes there,—
She bore him sons and daughters fair:

One day by the cradle she sat and sang,
Then heard she above how the church bells rang:

She went to the Merman, and kiss'd his brow;
'Once more to church I would gladly go.'

'And thou to church once more shalt go,
But come to thy babes back here below.'

He flung his arm her body around,
And he lifted her up unto England's ground.

Fair Agnes in at the church door stepp'd,
Behind her mother, who sorely wept.

'O, Agnes, Agnes, daughter dear!
Where hast thou been this many a year?'

---

[1] *George Borrow and his Circle*, 1914, pp. 104–10.

'O, I have been deep, deep under the sea,
And liv'd with the Merman in love and glee.'

'And what for thy honour did he give thee,
When he made thee his leman beneath the sea?

'He gave me silver, he gave me gold,
And sprigs of coral my hair to hold.'

The Merman up to the church door came;
His eyes they shone like a yellow flame;

His face was white and his beard was green—
A fairer demon was never seen.

'Now, Agnes, Agnes, list to me,
Thy babes are longing so after thee.'

'I cannot come yet, here must I stay
Until the priest shall have said his say.'

And when the priest had said his say,
She thought with her mother at home she'd stay.

'O Agnes, Agnes, list to me,
Thy babes are sorrowing after thee.'

'Let them sorrow and sorrow their fill,
But back to them never return I will.'

'Think on them, Agnes, think on them all;
Think on the great one, think on the small.'

'Little, O little, care I for them all,
Or for the great one, or for the small.'

O, bitterly then did the Merman weep;
He hied him back to the foamy deep:

But, often his shrieks and mournful cries,
At midnight's hour, from thence arise.

The general similarity between this ballad and Matthew Arnold's poem will be readily perceived, and though Mr Shorter does not expressly mention it as containing the germ of *The Forsaken Merman*, the reader will undoubtedly be tempted to connect the two poems.

There exists, however, another version of this Danish tradition, which is even more closely connected with *The Forsaken Merman*. It occurs in an article by Borrow in the January number of *The Universal Review* for 1825[1]. He is reviewing Just Mathias Thiele's *Danske Folkesagn* (*Danish Popular Legends*) and quotes the following tale:

> There lived once two poor people near Friesenborg, in the district of Aarhuus in Jutland, who had one only child, a daughter, called Grethe. One day that they sent her down to the sea-shore to fetch some sand, as she was washing her apron, a merman arose out of the water. His beard was greener than the salt sea; his shape was pleasing, and he spoke to the girl in a kind and friendly tone, and said, 'Come with me, Grethe, and I will give you as much gold and silver as your heart can wish.' 'That were not badly done,' replied she, 'for we have very little of it at home.' She let herself be prevailed on, and he took her by the hand, and brought

---

[1] Vol. II, pp. 563–64.

her down to the bottom of the sea, and she in the course of time became the mother of five children. When a long time had passed over, and she had nearly forgotten all she knew of religion, one festival morning as she was sitting with her youngest child in her lap, she heard the church bells ringing above, and there came over her mind great uneasiness, and an anxious longing to go to church. And as she sat there with her children, and sighed heavily, the merman observed her affliction, and enquired what made her so melancholy. She then coaxed him, and earnestly entreated him to let her go once more to church. The merman could not withstand her tears and solicitations, so he set her on the land, and charged her strictly to make haste back to the children. In the middle of the sermon, the merman came to the outside of the church, and cried, 'Grethe! Grethe!' She heard him plainly, but she thought she might as well stay till the service was over. When the sermon was concluded, the merman came again to the church, and cried, 'Grethe! Grethe! will you come quick?' but still she did not stir. He came once more, the third time, and cried, 'Grethe! Grethe! will you come quick? your children are crying for you.' But when she did not come, he began to weep bitterly, and went back to the bottom of the sea. But Grethe ever after stayed with her parents, and let the merman himself take care of his ugly little children, and his weeping and lamentation have been often heard from the bottom of the deep.

There is a tone of malicious satisfaction in these concluding lines which does not agree with Arnold's sympathetic description of the sorrowing merman. For this reason we might be at first inclined to think that Arnold was also familiar with Borrow's ballad, where the conclusion is less out of keeping with that of *The Forsaken Merman.* But there is, of course, always the possibility that Arnold may have arrived at this ending independently, and on the whole this seems the more likely. The similarity between the titles *The Deceived Merman* and *The Forsaken Merman* may also be a mere accident. In every other respect it seems to be the prose legend and not the ballad with which Arnold was acquainted. Notice especially

1. '’Twill be Easter-time in the world' [Arnold],
'One festival morning as she was sitting' [prose version].
[Nothing corresponding in the ballad.]

2. 'She sate......
And the youngest sate on her knee' [Arnold].
'As she was sitting with her youngest child in her lap' [prose version]. This is much nearer than
'One day by the cradle she sat and sang' [the ballad].

3. 'I lose my poor soul' [Arnold]. A hint of this is given in the prose version—'She had nearly forgotten all she knew of religion...she heard the church bells ringing above, and there came over her mind great uneasiness.' The ballad merely states that she wished to go to church again.

4. In the ballad, the maiden meets her mother, whilst in Arnold and the prose version this motive does not occur.

5. The merman's bride is called Margaret in Arnold, the equivalent of Grethe in the prose version, whereas she is Agnes in the ballad.

6. 'But ah, she gave me never a look' [Arnold]. In the ballad Agnes shouts disagreeable and cold-hearted replies to the merman. In the prose version as in Arnold, the maiden merely ignores his entreaties.

To sum up then, there seems every reason to believe that it is Borrow's article in *The Universal Review* and not his poem *The Deceived Merman* in *Romantic Ballads*, which contains the germ of *The Forsaken Merman*. There is just the bare possibility that Arnold was familiar with the ballad as well, but in view of the lack of any positive evidence in its favour, there scarcely seems any necessity to make this assumption.

HERBERT WRIGHT.

BANGOR.

'MEALY-MOUTHED.'

In the *Modern Language Review* for July, 1917 (p. 357), Mr Ernest Weekley asserts that the first element in *meal-mouth* (and the later *meal-mouthed*, *mealy-mouthed*) is not *meal*, farina, but represents the Primitive Germanic **meliþ*, honey. He also says that, whereas in the *Oxford English Dictionary* the earliest quotation for *meal-mouth* is dated 1546, its history really extends nearly three centuries further back, the word being recorded in A.D. 1279 as the surname of a certain Henry Millemuth.

Mr Weekley's novel etymological hypothesis involves some important and startling consequences. If *meal* in *meal-mouth* is the Germanic **meliþ*, it necessarily follows either that the simple word existed orally in Old English, although it has not been found in the extant remains of that language, or of any Germanic tongue except Gothic; or, what would be more extraordinary still, that while Old English had not retained the simple word, it had inherited the compound from pre-English times. On the latter supposition, the case would be parallel to that of *mildew*, with the important exception that, while the one word appears both in Old English and in continental writings, the other word has admittedly not been found recorded anywhere before A.D. 1279. Mr Weekley seems to have been so enthusiastically convinced—on grounds of intrinsic plausibility—of the truth of his novel hypothesis that he either did not shrink from its surprising implications, or forgot to enquire whether it had any implications at all.

Mr Weekley's view of the derivation of *meal-mouth* will gain no assent from etymologists who require to have evidence for their beliefs.

But his statement that the usually accepted derivation 'has no probability' has the merit of calling attention to a difficulty which many people may very likely have felt. It is not at first sight easy to understand how the word can have acquired its peculiar figurative meaning. Minsheu's explanation, that a mealy-mouthed person is one whose words are bland and soft like meal, has probably never satisfied anybody. A better solution of the difficulty seems to be suggested by the fact that in sixteenth-century German the phrase 'to keep meal in one's mouth' (*Mehl im Maule behalten*) meant 'to avoid speaking out decidedly.' The *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (s.v. *Mehl*) gives two quotations for the phrase. One of them is from Luther's Table-talk, where the reference is to people from whom it is impossible to extract any definite avowal of their attitude towards the Reformation doctrines. Obviously a man would not be likely to speak distinctly or forcibly if he had his mouth full of meal[1]. The figure of speech seems by no means wanting in aptness, and I think the notion it involves will account quite naturally for all the uses of the similar expressions in English. Mr Weekley is not correct in saying that the original sense of *meal-mouth* is 'flatterer.' The passage which he adduces, 'flatterers and meal-mouthed merchants,' is not a mere tautology; it means 'flatterers and merchants who avoid telling unwelcome truths.' A man earns the epithet 'mealy-mouthed' not by what he says, but by what he refrains from saying.

Whether the formation of the English compounds was suggested by the German idiom as met with in the controversial writings of the Reformation period, or whether the metaphor had been long current in English, I am not able to determine. If the surname *Millemuth* really means 'meal-mouth' (it cannot mean 'honey-mouth'!), the question is settled. But I feel strong doubt of this, on account of the spelling, and because there are other possible explanations, which I do not mention, as I am unwilling to venture on uncertain guesses. However the matter may stand with regard to this instance, I gratefully acknowledge that Mr Weekley's valuable investigations in the history of surnames have carried back the history of several English words considerably beyond the dates of the earliest examples given in the *Oxford English Dictionary*. This is only what was to be expected; words that belong to the popular idiom do not usually appear in literature until they have been long in colloquial use; and it is in the surnames and nicknames recorded in official documents that pre-literary instances are most likely to be found. Very likely Mr Weekley may be right in claiming *puss-cat* as one of the words which he has proved to be older than the Dictionary indicates; but we have to reckon with the possibility that Robert Pusekat may have been a Fleming who had brought his cognomen over with him from the Continent.

---

[1] Professor Craigie calls my attention to the following very pertinent passage from a Scottish ballad of 1570 (*Satirical Poems of the Time of the Reformation*, S.T.S., 1891, p. 131):

He can begyle ane Landwart Jock,
  Except he ken him weill;
Thay say he can baith quhissill and cloik,
  And his mouth full of meill.

HENRY BRADLEY.

OXFORD.

NOTES ON THE VOCABULARY OF THE GRAMMARIAN, VIRGILIUS MARO.

The following two lists of words taken from *Virgilii Maronis Epitomae* seem interesting as specimens of the Latin spoken in the Aquitanian part of Gaul. The first list is composed of Latin words with Romance characteristics: the second, of Latin words some of which seem to have been of Maro's own coinage, some to represent the Latin spoken in the literary circle of grammarians in which he lived and taught. There are many words in the surviving work of this astonishing grammarian which await explanation. Some of these are probably fanciful creations of a pedant; but others may probably be unriddled by a scholar familiar with old Basque: and a few others may be explained by O. Irish. I have taken the words from Huemer's edition, Leipsic 1886. Huemer in his preface remarks on the influence exercised by Maro as a grammarian in the Carolingian age and later. He is cited as an authority by Bede, Clemens Scotus, Cruindemelus and others. The most useful treatises on this singular author are Wilhelm Meyer's work, *Der Ludus de Antechristo* (Munich 1882), who explains Maro's account of Latin scansion; Paul Geyer, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des gallischen Lateins* (Wölfflin's *Archiv* II 25 *sqq.*) and Huemer's commentary on the *Epitomae* (Vienna 1882).

H. A. STRONG.

SLOUGH.

I.

p. 5 scripturas, used as nom. case.
10 trienta = triginta.
18 facia = facies.
22 vir sensatus = sensé.
25 trea = tres.
28 goëla (Germ. geil) = lectuosus : cf. galant.
28 poera = pavor.
33 lustri = ignobili, loustique?
p. 36 accusare = agere : cf. accuser réception d'une lettre.
37 tenebras, used as nom.
40 camara = chambre.
45 illas and ipsas, used as nom.
47 tus = tuus.
59 isponte = sponte.
66 semare = semer.
78 buonum = bonum.
110 cata = chatte.

II.

polus, the world.
connumeratio, an account or description.
contractus (pecuniarum), the amassing or gathering.
ratiocinari, to aim at.
sectae = philosophi.
tellea, earthly.
internare, to penetrate.
pada, used for a plea or excuse, pfad ?
perfendire, to make one's way to.
moda, manner.
plastus, substance.
affla, breath.
canitus, in olden times.
omnimodatim, in every way.
accito, to endeavour.
construmentum, support.
emulus = utilis.
minula (dimin. of mina), used apparently in the signification of a sect: and also in that of a component particle (sapidinis, itself used for sapientia).
oratorium, the language.
usurpare, to come into use.
offendire, to find.
caraxare (χαράσσειν), to write, to describe.
eloquentio, an expression.
atramentare, to write.
ars, apparently used for a syllable. ἄρθρον ?
gammula, gamma according to Ducange = the border of a field: used by V.M. for a measure.
carminula, the rhythm of verses.
soffare, to blow a breath.
quassi = sentences ?
suffunare, to support.
spirido = spiritus.
clefare, to narrate, to speak. O.H.G. klaphôn.
proscriptivus, standing at the beginning of a word.
forciosus, emphatic, bearing the stress accent.
motatio, composition or making up of a word.
magnissimus = maximus.
vernalis, natural, specially characteristic.
aliquidatio, a fusion of two vowels as in a diphthong.
computum, a symbol of number: a letter of the alphabet marking a number.
persanatio, a clear statement (metrorum).
taxare, to reckon, or value.
pensatura, measure (of poetry).
medietas, a half (moitié).
disparatus, separated.
mederii versus, verses adapted for singing, and rhymed (modus ?).
fistilla = fistulae.
modelus, melodious.
gresus = congressus, meeting or fusion (duum pedum).
discretio, a distinction.
confusibilitas, confusion.
calcare, to depress, pronounce without raising the voice.
leporici, balladmongers (of cantamenta and cantatellae).
sepiter, saepe.
gande, gandis seems to mean the course or drift of time. Wende ?
mentiuncula, mention.
intentio, the aim.
sapificare, to pursue wisdom.
grama, grammar, = grammatica.
prætendere, to aim at.
emulitas, utility; possibly influenced by emolumentum.
curiositas, the satisfaction of knowledge.
praepalare (palam), to exhibit.
deffendentia, scope or aim (artium).
agglomere, to confuse.
festim = confestim.
preciti = citissimi.
leporia (ars) seems to mean rhetorical prose.
locuplex = locuples.
pugitare, to hesitate; formed from piget.
pervidatio, the scrutiny: grammar is said to be the pervidatio litteraturae.
semitula, the path.
lectio, the process of reading.
dialecta, logic.
exinterare atque effibrare (viscera sententiarum), to turn inside out and prove minutely the strict meaning.
pictura, used for a logician's criticism.
avidare, to await eagerly.
indebitum, not owed.
immorosus, continuous (of conversation).
cupire = cupere.
deundare, to ebb (of the tide).
belsa = campus. O. Irish ?
pope = fortitudine.
sapidiosus, pedantic (applied to logicians).

geometres, herbalists.
infatua (mulier), apparently hysterical.
uxorari (of a woman), to be married.
sensatus, sensible.
famulatus, connexion (of body and spirit).
praesulare, to rule over (cum dat.).
breviarius = brevis.
quaerimonare = quaerere.
divitia, a special quality.
primatus = primus.
carnalis (cognatio), blood-relationship.
diffiteor, to deny, and diffissio, denial.
animalis = animal.
sequestrare, to disregard.
proficere, to affect (in bonam partem).
luster is defined as = ignobilis, loustique?
pagilla = pagina.
commonitoria verba, words of advice.
siderare = considerare.
deacutus, blunted.
extinctorius, liable to extinguish.
terere (verbum), to employ a word.
accusare paenitudinem, to perform penance.
operatio, the influence of the stars.
subministratoria (pars orationis), subservient.
autenticum, correct (of usage).
cuiatim and meatim said to be adverbs formed from cuius and meus respectively.
abhinc, henceforward.
ratare, to decide.
intellectio, a synonym.
reesse, to be beleaguered (of troops in a garrison).
subreptive, secretly or furtively.
completorii, reckoners (of the calendar).
succinctim, briefly.
consequentia, identity or correspondence (of letters in a word).
semo = semino.
con, described as an adverb = illuc.
elimatius, with more exactness.
indecorosus, out of place.
statio, statement.
efficientia, significations or powers of a word.
prolitas, power of bearing children, fecundity.
mulitas = mollitas, softness.
cantilicum, a poetical expression (of thanks).
soceritas = societas.
bessus, assumed as origin of *bestia* = hoc est de more feritatis. Basque *besu*, habit: or O. Fr. bisse, a snake?
pus, explained as = custodia in philosophia.
gabul = vulpis, cf. goupil[1].

UN BILLET DE PAUL-LOUIS COURIER.

Le *British Museum* possède, relié dans un exemplaire des *Ποιμενικά* (Pastorales) de Longus (1074, l. 14), un billet de P.-L. Courier, que je ne trouve pas publié dans ses *Œuvres*. Il n'a guère d'autre intérêt que d'ajouter un nom à la liste des correspondants de Courier, et un trait au tableau de l'Europe savante internationale en 1814. Son destinataire, le D^r^ Charles Burney, était alors l'un des philologues anglais les plus réputés; sa notice bibliographique au Catalogue du *British Museum* ne comprend pas moins de six colonnes; il ne s'est pas occupé de Longus.

---

[1] Meyer in *Sitzungsberichte der K. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1912) has pointed out that the Gaulish students of Latin, a language in many points resembling their own, were not unfrequently in the habit of coining words of hybrid formation. Thus a Latin word was given a new signification derived from similar Gaulish words. Maro uses the word suapte (classical Latin suopte) in the sense of *well-adapted*, as if it were derived from the Gaulish *su* (Welsh hy-, Greek *εὐ-*) and from the Latin *apte*.

A Monsieur | Monsieur Le Docteur Burney. | A Greenwik. | Angleterre.

Paris le 3 Aoust 1814[1].

Monsieur,

Vous devez avoir reçu par les mains de Mr Joachim un volume Grec contenant le texte de Longus que j'ai fait imprimer a Rome. J'ai pensé que ce livre rare[2] et curieux par les variantes considerables extraites de deux Manuscrits vous feroit plaisir a avoir, et je vous prie, Monsieur, d'agreer ce petit present comme une marque de l'estime que m'inspirent vos rares connoissances. Vous me feriez grand plaisir de m'en accuser la reception.

J'ai l'honneur d'etre, Monsieur
Votre tres humble
et obeist serviteur
COURIER.

Mon adresse rue du grand chantier
N° 8. au marais
a Paris.

La lettre présente deux cachets, l'un rond et noir: Foreign Au[gust] 4 1814; l'autre ovale et ocre: 4 o'clock Au[gust] 6 1814 EV.— L'exemplaire susdit des *Pastorales* a toujours, sous le faux-titre, une étiquette écrite à la main portant: le Dr Burney L.D. etc. a Greenwich près de Londres.

G. RUDLER.

LONDRES.

---

[1] La publication de l'ouvrage remonte à 1810. Napoléon était parti pour l'île d'Elbe le 28 avril 1814. Mais l'envoi tardif du volume peut s'expliquer autrement que par les circonstances politiques. Burney naquit en 1757 et mourut en 1817.

[2] Il a été tiré à cinquante-deux exemplaires numérotés (voir à la fin du volume). Celui du Dr Burney porte le N° 4. Un autre, provenant de la collection du Rt. Hon. Thomas Grenville et comprenant la lettre de Courier de 1er octobre 1812 (Br. Mus. G. 7699), porte le N° 18.

REVIEWS.

William Haughton's 'Englishmen for my Money.' Edited with introduction and notes by ALBERT CROLL BAUGH. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1917. 8vo. 236 pp.

Haughton's story is that of a hack of Henslowe's. Indeed, apart from the seventy-five occasions on which his name appears in the old manager's diary and correspondence, the only certain record we have of him is the nuncupative will discovered by Mr C. W. Wallace and printed for the first time in the present volume. From this we learn that Haughton died between 6 June and 20 July 1605. The entries in the *Diary* extend from 5 Nov. 1597 to 8 Sept. 1602, thus covering a period of nearly five years from his first appearance as 'yonge horton' to a date within three years of his death. Outside these limits our knowledge of his life is a blank. He died in the parish of Allhallows Staining, London, leaving a widow and children. His colleague Wentworth Smith was witness to his will.

Haughton's dramatic activity falls into four periods: the first, the winter of 1597–8, to which belongs, so far as we know, only *Englishmen for my Money*; the second from the summer of 1599 to the spring of 1600, during which time, and chiefly between November and May, he was at work on no less than twelve plays; the third from Dec. 1600 to Nov. 1601, from which records of nine plays survive; the fourth a brief return in Sept. 1602 with a single piece. All the records are in connexion with the Admiral's men. In the intervals, it is reasonable to suppose, Haughton was exercising his talents for other companies.

Englishmen for my Money is the only play of Haughton's known to survive, which there is reason to suppose was an unaided effort. It is certainly a creditable achievement for a young writer. Mr Baugh would put the claim a good deal higher, and not altogether without cause shown. In the absence of any close parallels we must regard Haughton's plot as essentially original and the threads are skilfully woven. Our knowledge of dramatic chronology is far from complete, but, if the claim of *Englishmen for my Money* to be the first 'realistic comedy of London life' is well founded, it certainly gives its author a respectable place in the history of our drama. The originality of the conception is, however, a good deal discounted by the fact that several similar studies of provincial life appeared about the same time.

Of the nature of *Cox of Collumpton* we know nothing, for Collier's assertion that it concerned a murder committed at that place, though a plausible guess, appears to be devoid of foundation. *Beech's Tragedy* or the *Tragedy of Thomas Merry* raises the difficult question of its relation to Yarington's *Two Lamentable Tragedies.* I think it must be taken as proved that the latter was written not later than 1598 and consequently that it cannot be an amalgamation of *Beech's Tragedy* and the *Orphans' Tragedy* of 1599–1600. But Mr Baugh's natural annoyance at finding this wretched stuff ascribed in part to his author, has led him to a quite unfair treatment of the arguments on which the identification has been based. If the plays in question are altogether unrelated, we have a very remarkable coincidence. Coincidences do occur, and there the discussion had probably best be left.

The payments for *Patient Grissel*, in which Haughton's share is probably small, are very perplexing, and Mr Baugh has not given a very clear account of them (incidentally omitting to mention the £6 paid 26 Dec. 1599). Apart from the 10*s.* which were probably in earnest of a second part never written, Henslowe certainly paid £10 (£1 and £3 in earnest, and £6 probably in full though not so marked). But it is not safe to argue that this really represents what the Admiral's men paid for the play: it only represents what they borrowed from Henslowe on the plea of paying for the play. The authors may have repaid the advances (though it was hardly their wont to do so!) or may have applied them to other work on hand. I can only repeat what I have said elsewhere that 'The confusion of these entries shews what caution is necessary in making elaborate inferences from Henslowe's accounts.' The entry of the play on the Stationers' Register ten days after £2 had been paid to stay the printing, a fact which once surprised me and evidently surprises Mr Baugh, is quite certainly to be explained, as he suggests, as a formal assertion of copyright. The play was not printed for fully three years.

Mr Baugh considers the identification of the *Spanish Moor's Tragedy* with *Lust's Dominion* as practically established. He regards II, iii–v and III, v as presumably Haughton's but does not discuss Day's or Dekker's shares or the possible Marlowan residue.

The *Seven Wise Masters* must have been one of those conglomerate performances in which a number of dramatic episodes are strung together as plays within a play, of which we have some knowledge from the plot of the *Seven Deadly Sins*, and which may conceivably trace back their pedigree to the Pater Noster play of York.

Ferrex and Porrex, as Mr Baugh observes, is more likely to have been an original piece, possibly suggested by Sackville and Norton's famous play, than a revision of that work. As to the subject of the *English Fugitives* he forbears conjecture.

It is quite likely that the play mentioned in Henslowe's *Diary* which Haughton 'would call the *Devil and his Dame*' is connected with the extant *Grim the Collier of Croyden*, but the evidence that Haughton really was concerned in the writing or revision of the piece is slight. Still, as Mr Baugh is inclined to find some trace of his hand in the first scene, the latter at least is possible.

Strange News out of Poland introduces the mysterious 'Mr Pett,' who, it is now suggested, may possibly be a certain Peter Pett who ended a brief and idle London career by dying of small-pox about a month later than the entry in the *Diary*. The identification is possible but no more: it is not pressed. A play of *Judas*, of which it is suggested that Haughton may have left a draft subsequently elaborated by Samuel Rowley and William Birde or Borne, closes the author's second period of activity in connexion with Henslowe.

In July 1600 the Admiral's men ceased playing at the Rose: they began again at the Fortune about the beginning of December. That month Haughton was engaged on *Robin Hood's Pen'orths*, a piece which Mr Baugh conjectures may have been on the subject of Robin Hood's adventure with the Potter as it appears in the May Games printed at the end of the *Geste* (see Malone Society's *Collections*, i. 132). The suggestion is again a possible one. This was followed the following spring by collaboration with Day in two continuations of the *Blind Beggar of Bethnal Green*, a piece with which Day and Chettle had evidently made a hit the previous year. The first part only is extant (possibly in a later revision).

In the spring of 1601 we find Haughton collaborating for the first time with Wentworth Smith in the *Conquest of the West Indies.* This Mr Baugh would connect with a tract on the exploits of Cortes translated by Thomas Nicholas, which had been reprinted in 1596.

Both *Six Yeomen of the West* by Haughton and Day, and the two parts of the *Six Clothiers* by Haughton, Hathway and Smith, which belong to the summer and autumn of 1601, must have been based on Deloney's *Thomas of Reading*, and a 'second part' of *Tom Dough* by Haughton and Day of the same period was very likely a continuation of the first-named, and based on the same work. That a single novel should have furnished matter for four plays within a twelvemonth is perhaps a record.

Friar Rush and the Proud Woman of Antwerp has been conjectured by Creizenach to be a combination of the well-known devil story with a telling anecdote out of Stubbes' *Anatomy of Abuses*, also alluded to in Greene's *Tu Quoque.* I think the suggestion is more than 'rather plausible' as Mr Baugh styles it.

To the last period belongs *William Cartwright* alone. Mr Baugh calls this an 'unaided piece' and it is true that no other author is named in connexion with it. But we only have record of a payment of 50*s*. which cannot have been in full, so that it is quite possible that here again Haughton was working in collaboration. There is always a temptation to rely on Henslowe's entries for more than they are worth. They are so useful, and in a manner so authoritative, that one is apt to forget their limitations. It is worth while, therefore, to insist once more that they are not intended as records of authorship but merely of the names of those to whom Henslowe paid out certain sums by order of the company. That as a rule the money for plays was paid to the authors, hardly admits of doubt, but that in every particular case the recipient was the author, or that all collaborators are necessarily mentioned, there is no warrant to suppose. No document is more valuable for the history of the Elizabethan drama than Henslowe's *Diary*, but none has been more misused. As a rule Mr Baugh is very judicious in his use of its evidence, but in this and a few other instances he is inclined to rely rather too implicitly thereon.

Haughton wrote for the most part in collaboration. *Englishmen for my Money*, which there is every reason to suppose is his unaided work, may be regarded as a diploma piece. Out of twenty-two other plays for which he received payments, only six are connected with his name alone. His most frequent and continuous collaborator was Day, who shared in nine pieces. In his second period he also joined forces with Chettle thrice, and with Dekker thrice; while in his third he thrice worked with Wentworth Smith and twice with Hathway. His connexion with Birde and Rowley is problematic, and his association with 'Mr Pett' may or may not have been literary.

The almost feverish activity of his two middle periods suggests a fertile brain and probably an empty pocket. The variety of the themes chosen is also remarkable. 'He apparently turned his hand with equal ease to almost any type of drama, and the number of types he tried is consequently large. He seems to have written in the fashion of the moment and to have changed as often as the fashion changed,' is the verdict of his editor. In style of work, to judge from the scanty remains extant, he may not unreasonably be regarded as a forerunner of Middleton. His work has some interest, if not very much attraction, of itself, but Haughton's chief claim on our attention is as a good example of the dramatic hack of the time.

Mr Baugh has handled his not very promising materials with skill and discretion, and has produced a work that will take its place as a permanent contribution to the history of the minor drama. There are few faults to find, but he should not speak of 'Lyly's *Maid's Metamorphosis*' (the authorship is far from proven), while to say that 'the daughter of Barabas enters a monastery' may be correct but suggests scandal.

Mr Baugh's text of *Englishmen for my Money* is a very careful piece of work. He charges nine errors against the Malone Society reprint. I regret to say that in six cases he is right, the other three are merely wrong-fount letters which it is not our custom to reproduce. A pleasant and novel feature of the notes is the attention given to the technical stage-construction of the play.

W. W. Greg.

London.

A Study of the Plays of Thomas D'Urfey, with a Reprint of 'A Fool's Preferment.' Parts I and II. By Robert Stanley Forsythe (Western Reserve University Bulletins. Vol. xix, No. 5. May, 1916. Vol. xx, No. 5. May, 1917). Cleveland, Ohio: Western Reserve University Press. Part I, vi + 180 pp.; Part II, 100 pp.

When we consider how interesting a figure Tom D'Urfey makes, what real merit many of his comedies have, and how lengthy was his dramatic career, it is extraordinary into what oblivion he has fallen. Not only is he neglected, but critics and literary historians have almost with one accord thrust him into outer darkness and joined in a chorus of merciless condemnation. Nettleton who (in a History of the Restoration Drama!) devotes one line to D'Urfey terms him 'an example of prolix mediocrity,' which he assuredly was not; Whibley insists that 'he knew no other wit than horseplay,' a sentence unjust to a degree; whilst even Sir Adolphus Ward—who however frankly allows that he has a very slight acquaintance with D'Urfey's theatre (*English Dramatic Literature*, III, p. 454, *n.* 2, 1899)—calls him the 'literary nadir of Restoration comedy—and indeed of the Restoration drama in general,' a judgement which with all deference to that distinguished scholar seems manifestly and demonstrably untrue. With these philippics ringing in our ears it is indeed an agreeable surprise to take up a comedy of D'Urfey's and to find instead of the abysmal dullness, the flat duncery, the torpid vulgarities we might expect, bright bustling scenes full of movement, no lack of vigour and fun, together with situations which, if nearly allied to farce, must, on the stage, at least, have been irresistibly droll. But D'Urfey's dramas are amongst the most inaccessible of our Restoration quartos, and comparatively few of his plays can be found save in the first editions. For this reason then if for no other—and there are many—we warmly welcome Dr Forsythe's monograph and the accompanying reprint of *A Fool's Preferment.* It is, we believe, the only serious and detailed study of D'Urfey that exists, and as such it is not only valuable in itself, but should assuredly be instrumental in mitigating the future opinions of critics who have to appraise the worth of 'lyric Tom'—'I hold he loves me best who calls me Tom.'

Dr Forsythe has given us in order the title-pages of the first quartos, some remarks upon each play, the *dramatis personae* as originally set out, and the argument of the piece. Failing a complete collection, fully edited with notes critical and textual—and this, we hope, will one day come—it is hard to see what better plan could be adopted.

The dramatic work of D'Urfey covered an exceptionally long and extraordinarily interesting period in our stage history. Charles Hart, Mohun, and Pepys' Mrs Knepp created rôles in his early plays; John Mills, Barton Booth, pretty Mrs Bicknell, and Mary Porter, who died as late as 1765, appeared in his last acted comedy; whilst in 1721 he was publishing operas and a tragedy (never performed) originally intended for Betterton and Mrs Barry. In *The Injured Princess*, a deplorable adaptation of *Cymbeline*, produced early in 1682, we have the famous stage direction: '*Enter behind* Cymbeline, Queen, *a Purse*, Pisanio, Doctor *and* Guards, *a Viol*, Mrs Holten, Sue.' Genest's suggestion that Mrs Holten was Mrs Holden is indubitably correct, but it is very misleading to term her, as Dr Forsythe does not hesitate to do, 'a veteran actress of the day.' Mrs Holden had as a mere girl been, it is true, one of Davenant's original actresses in 1661, but that was no more than twenty-one years before, and in all probability at the date of the production of *The Injured Princess* she would be about forty-one. In the notes again to *A Fool's Preferment*, produced *circa* March, 1688, Mrs Boutel is alluded to as 'a veteran actress.' As I have already shown in my article on this actress (*Notes and Queries*, 12 S. II, p. 381), she joined Killigrew whilst very young, and in 1688 would be hardly more than forty-five. Here too 'veteran actress' is an unnecessary and indeed inaccurate term. Neither Genest nor Dr Forsythe tells us that Sue in the stage direction is, of course, Sue Percival, who afterwards became the celebrated Mrs Mountfort, and *en secondes noces* Mrs Verbruggen.

Dr Forsythe passes without comment the presence of Mrs Marshall and Mrs Hughes, leading ladies of the Theatre Royal, in the cast of *A Fond Husband* produced at the Duke's House in 1676. The explanation is that just at that time constant quarrels were occurring amongst the King's company, and members of either house would, upon the slightest pretext, transfer their services to the rival theatre, a state of things which continued for three or four years in spite of repeated warrants from the king and orders to punish severely these migratory practices. Indeed at one period the Theatre Royal closed down altogether until Lord Arlington under royal mandate compelled them to reopen their doors, a fact hitherto unknown to stage historians.

Dr Forsythe has noticed the difficulty concerning the dates of *A Fond Husband* and *Madam Fickle*. He rightly puts *A Fond Husband* first. It was licensed (for printing) June 15th, 1676, and so probably produced in the spring. *Madam Fickle* was licensed Nov. 20th, 1676, and was produced in the autumn. But it should have been remarked that *The Siege of Memphis* appears in the Term Catalogues for Michaelmas, 1676, and although generally accepted as D'Urfey's first play, it may well have been acted after *A Fond Husband*. This crux ought to have been discussed.

And here with a word of emphatic warning we must draw attention to the fact that Dr Forsythe relies altogether too implicitly upon Genest, who in spite of his many excellent qualities and copious industry, often errs sadly when dealing with the forty years from 1660 to 1700. Amongst other mistakes resulting from this we would point out that *Squire Oldsapp* (p. 27) was not acted early in 1678 but in October or perhaps even November of that year; *The Virtuous Wife* (p. 31) appeared on the stage in the autumn of 1679, not in 1680; *Sir Barnaby Whigg* (p. 37) was produced not later than October, 1681, and when Genest says 'In the 4th act Sir Barnaby Whigg is called Rabbi Achitophel—the play therefore could not have come out till about December,' he is quite at fault. As early as 1680 a tract, *Absalom's Conspiracy*, had applied the name Achitophel to Shaftesbury, and successive lampoons perpetuated it before Dryden's great poem. On p. 68 is given the title-page of the 1696 edition of *Love for Money*, a comedy which was printed in 1691, a fact which hardly seems to have been sufficiently clear to Dr Forsythe. The first quarto has title-page thus: Love | For | Money: | Or, The | Boarding School. | A | Comedy. | Written by Mr Durfey. | London: | Printed for *Abel Roper* at the *Mitre* in *Fleetstreet*, and are to | be sold by *Randal Taylor* near *Stationers-Hall*. 1691. | This edition is of an excessive rarity.

D'Urfey says he wrote the play in June, 1689, and it was probably performed in the winter of that year. It had a tremendous success, and Dr Forsythe has, we think, rather misunderstood the point of Gildon's comment. It is more surprising that Dr Forsythe does not mention that most important pamphlet, 'Wit for Money: or Poet Stutter. A Dialogue between *Smith, Johnson,* and *Poet Stutter.* Containing Reflections on some late Plays; and particularly on *Love for Money,* or, *The Boarding-School,*' 1691. Poet Stutter is, of course, D'Urfey, who in the words of a scarce piece, 'The Session of the Poets, Holden at the Foot of Parnassus-Hill July the 9th, 1696,' used to starve 'poor *Venter* to keep a Foot-Boy dangling after him. He always Stutters but when he Swears.' The foot-boy Jack featly dances attendance on the poet in 'Wit for Money.' This clever pasquil accuses D'Urfey of taking the situation between Betty Jiltall and Jack Amorous from the scene between Diana and Wilding in *The City Heiress*; of plagiarising the kidnapping of Mirtilla to the Indies from Lacy's *Sir Hercules Buffoon*; of borrowing the list read by Lady Addleplot from Tegue O'Divelly's catalogue in *The Amorous Bigot*; of conveying Nicompoop bodily from Bisket in *Epsom Wells.* In his criticism moreover of *The Marriage-Hater Match'd* (pp. 82—91) Dr Forsythe should undoubtedly have found place for a detailed account of *Poeta Infamis, or a Poet not worth Hanging,* 1692, a lampoon which tells us how D'Urfey personally taught Anthony Leigh the humours of the rôle of Van Grin, and how he prided himself upon the novelty La Pupsey. Dr Forsythe notices none of these things.

Dr Forsythe marshals the facts he has to present in a very precise and perspicuous way, but save for the many parallels he adduces he gives us nothing strikingly original in the way of criticism, and of his parallels not a few seem, to me at least, to be rather far-fetched and oblique. In his account of *The Royalist* (pp. 43–4) he has omitted to remember Mrs Behn's transferring of the predicament between Kinglove and Philippa to *The Younger Brother* as between Welborn and Olivia, a point to which I drew attention in my edition of Mrs Behn (IV, 314). I suspect that Ravenscroft in *The London Cuckolds* (1681; 4to, 1682) when writing of Mr Ramble, 'A great Designer on Ladies, but unsuccessfull in his Intrigues,' did not forget D'Urfey's Beauford, 'A young wild unfortunate fellow, always engaging himself in Intrigues, but never prospering in any,' *The Virtuous Wife* (1679; 4to, 1680).

It is not hypercritical to say that in Dr Forsythe's monograph we miss that vivid enthusiasm and those stylistic graces which are so evident and so inspiring in the work of eminent scholars and men of letters such as Bullen, Edmund Gosse, and Sir Adolphus Ward, whose introductions, criticisms, and annotations would be a pure delight merely from their literary charm even were they not also that flower of profound erudition and tireless zeal the world has approvedly recognised them to be. There is in Dr Forsythe's pages a tendency to skeletonise and to outline where detail, circumstance, and colour would be grateful and interesting. Nevertheless he has brought considerable research and care to his work and is highly to be complimented upon the result, which is a valuable addition to the history of the Restoration drama.

A Fool's Preferment is a capital choice for a reprint, but at the risk of being prolix there should decidedly have been appended an explanation of the basset terms which are so frequent in this play, and to omit Purcell's music to the Songs is, we feel sure, a grave blemish. With regard to the notes occasionally we have a comment which seems superfluous, and once or twice a word or passage is passed over where some elucidation is certainly required. Thus the phrase 'his Legs and Cringes' (p. 23) is correctly explained as 'scrapes and bows.' This surely might have been understood. The quite common term 'to make a leg' occurs as late as *Edwin Drood* (c. xviii)—' "I beg pardon," said Mr Datchery, making a leg.' On p. 26, Tester is defined as 'a shilling of Henry VIII's reign.' This is hardly exact. 'Tester' is derivative from Teston, the Henry VIII shilling of fluctuating value, which was recalled in 1548. But for D'Urfey a tester was sixpence. So in Farquhar's *Love and a Bottle* (1698), Brush cries, 'Who throws away a Tester and a mistress loses sixpence.' On p. 56 '*Crabs Eyes* or *Spaw-water*' is left without a note. Crabs-eyes is the name given to a concretion found in the stomach of the crayfish. It was formerly used in medicine as an absorbent and antacid. The *New English Dictionary* has examples 1605, 1693, etc. Spaw-water (spa-water) is the water derived from mineral springs. Steele, *Tatler*, No. 107 (1709), speaks of 'a Bottle of Spaw-Water.' P. 79, 'Quean' is explained as 'jade, hussy, harlot.' P. 27, 'a Farmer's blowing' is left without elucidation. For the signification of this slang term, see 'An Explanation of the Cant' prefixed to Shadwell's *Squire of Alsatia* (4to, 1688), also my note on the word 'Convenient,' Mrs Behn's Works, II, p. 433. On p. 78 'Clanbriggian,' to which Dr Forsythe has no clue, merely means a Teague, in modern parlance Paddy. Act II, sc. 1 of *A Fool's Preferment* should have been compared with the parallel gaming-scene in *The Basset-Table*, produced at Drury Lane, 20th Nov. 1705, 4to, 1706. Dr Forsythe has no reference to Mrs Centlivre's comedy which deals with the same fashionable game as is exhibited by D'Urfey.

We notice that Dr Forsythe in the preface to his study, Part I, has 'The last reprint of any of them [D'Urfey's plays] was that of the *Don Quixote* comedies in 1729.' In his introduction to *A Fool's Preferment*, Part II, he again states this 'is the only play of D'Urfey to be reprinted since 1729.' The assertion is incorrect. A very delightful reprint of *A Commonwealth of Women* appeared under the auspices of Edmund Goldsmid at Edinburgh in 1886. There are, it is true, no notes, but the text is admirably presented.

A detailed study of D'Urfey indubitably offers unsuspected problems which require the nicest judgement to resolve. Dr Forsythe has done some commendable pioneer work, and it would be in the highest degree ungenerous not to recognise the pains and industry he has brought to a period which has its own peculiarly evasive difficulties and cunning pitfalls.

LONDON. MONTAGUE SUMMERS.

The Statesmanship of Wordsworth, an Essay. By A. V. DICEY. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1917. 8vo. viii + 134 pp.

In this book, written partly with a view to present-day events, Professor Dicey has rendered a real service to Wordsworthian studies, and to the history of the growth of modern political conceptions. Wordsworth, indeed, has taken long to discover. M. Legouis, some twenty years ago, was the first to work out in detail how intimately his earlier life was influenced by the French Revolution, and to what an extent the inspiration and teaching of the poems of his prime, the greater part of the work by which he lives, depended on the passionate creed of Liberty and the hopes for mankind in which the Revolution was born. But M. Legouis, perhaps, and Professor Harper following him, have laid excessive stress on the ill consequences of the poet's disillusionment, when France became imperial and aggressive, and have been inclined to regard his gradual change of opinion from Revolutionary hopes to Conservatism, from 'semi-atheism' to Christianity, as a fall, however excusable; and to divide sharply the two Wordsworths, the inspired poet and prophet of his earlier years, and the dead, if venerable, husk of his old age. There is something to be said in modification of a view which attributes the natural relaxing of hard-strained faculties to the abandonment of opinions which few would maintain to be exactly true; something, too, against a wholesale condemnation of Wordsworth's later poems with the invariable exception of the *Ode composed upon an evening of extraordinary splendour and beauty*—Matthew Arnold's selection, which omits the *Ode*, tells a different story. But it is of most importance that Wordsworth's conception of the primary values of life did not change in essentials, that he was not a reed shaken by varying winds. Mr Dicey works out at least one element in Wordsworth's political thought which runs through his whole life. This was unexpectedly modern, Nationalism, belief in the right of a nation to work out its own salvation and to maintain its independence. This faith, Mr Dicey shows, Wordsworth held as early as 1792 when foreign powers were attempting to restore the French monarchy; it forms the basis of the perfervid argument of his *Tract on the Convention of Cintra* in 1809; and is the theme of the noble *Sonnets dedicated to Liberty.* It coincided with his hatred of the despotism and lawless aggression of Napoleon, and is one of the links of the Revolutionary exaltation of his youth with the distrust of change which marked his old age. In 1837 Wordsworth was one of the few Englishmen who sympathized with the aspirations for the unity and freedom of Italy, which he had been one of the first to desire in the *Convention of Cintra.* Professor Dicey aptly quotes the fine *Sonnet from the Alban Hills* in proof of the fact, and the *Sonnets at Bologna in remembrance of the late insurrections* show the same ruling thought.

But the *Tract on the Convention of Cintra*, Mr Dicey urges, does not merely show the consistency and modernity of Wordsworth, it is evidence for his statesmanship, if we may apply that term to a sober grasp of wise general principles of policy and of their corollaries in action. Wordsworth bases his argument on the right of an organized national state to genuine independence. He claims it as a necessity for the healthy development of the race. He hopes for the union of conscious nations then in fragments, Germany and Italy, and maintains that by their union a stable balance of power, the object of statesmen then and now, may be attained. But he recognizes the difficulties then extant in Spain, and the dangers in his own ideal for Europe. Unreal or rose-coloured pleas, here as elsewhere, he disregards; he painfully, too painfully, grapples his argument to undeniable facts. For all his fervour he is a temperate and wary crusader. A nation needs internal freedom to obtain the main value of its independence, he says in effect, but national independence is indispensable to the existence of civil liberty. So, too, with the example of France before him, he dreads the irresistible power of one nation, even his own, and urges the voluntary equal union of the smaller states. Thus a stable balance of power may be maintained.

It is not surprising that the great *Tract* has never been a popular work. Its fire is not a light-giving flame, but a white-hot glow. This is not merely an effect of long-winded sentences. The principles on which the thesis is founded emerge slowly and partially late in the argument. They receive their completion in a subsequent *Vindication*, which was not published till 1876. This is, so to say, true to life, but, in consequence, we struggle through corollaries before we reach the proposition. Some obscurity and clumsiness were all the more natural owing to the originality of the *Tract*. Wordsworth seems to have had no English precursors in his conception of Nationalism. Mr Dicey is at pains to show that Mazzini belonged to a later generation and was uninfluenced by his English predecessor. It is possible, however, that Wordsworth received some clue from Mazzini's forerunner Alfieri. Wordsworth may well have read and admired some works of Alfieri during his stay in France or even later, and more especially the *Del Principe e delle Lettere* published in 1789 where the ideal of the union and freedom of Italy finds its first expression in modern times. It is not easy to say what Wordsworth did or did not read during his residence in France, but fresh light might be obtained could we recover the original text of the *Prelude* as it left the poet's hands in the years 1799–1805.

C. W. PREVITÉ-ORTON.

CAMBRIDGE.

Pronunciation of English Vowels, 1400—1700. By R. E. ZACHRISSON. (Göteborgs Kungl. Vetenskaps- och Vitterhets-samhälles Handlingar. Fjärde Följden. xiv: 2). Göteborg. 1913. xiv + 232 pp.

The centre of interest in English linguistic studies both at home and abroad has, during the last twenty years, shifted from Old English to Middle English and now the best work both in Germany and in Scandinavia is being done on the later period of Middle English and, more especially, on the transition from Middle to Modern English. The names chiefly associated with these developments are those of Jespersen, Luick and Horn. Now there must be added the name of R. E. Zachrisson who by the book at present under review has shown himself worthy of holding a position side by side with these distinguished scholars. Dr Zachrisson's name is already familiar to a small number of students from his place-name studies. His present book should make a much wider appeal.

The main problem at issue is 'which were the N. E. correspondents to the M. E. vowels during the period 1400—1700, and when did the so-called Continental pronunciation of the English vowels cease to exist?' Dr Zachrisson first examines the 'Orthographical' evidence, to be found in letters of the fifteenth century, more especially in the Paston Letters and the Cely Papers. Here he is careful to reject all tainted or uncertain evidence, e.g. possible dialect forms, and ultimately arrives at certain conclusions the most important of which are that already by 1500 *ā* was pronounced as (æ·) or (ε·), *ai, ei* as (æ^{i}) or (ε^{i}) perhaps even (æ·) or (ε·), ẹ̄ as (i·), ę̄ as (ε·) or (e·), *ī* as (ei), ọ̄ as (u·), *ū* as (əu) or (au), *u* sometimes as ʌ.

Next he deals with the 'Orthoepistical' evidence, first of English and French Grammars written by Frenchmen, then of French Grammars written by Englishmen. Here Zachrisson prints in full much evidence from books hitherto unknown or ones which have not received their proper meed of consideration, while his thorough knowledge of historical French phonology stands him in good stead. From this evidence he confirms the conclusions formed on the orthographical evidence, namely that as early as the 16th century 'all the great changes characteristic of the English pronunciation as opposed to the Continental had then commenced.' The evidence of English Grammars by Englishmen has already received a good deal of attention from Jespersen and others, but Zachrisson subjects it all to a fresh and careful study in the light of the evidence already adduced in the earlier part of the volume. Here more clearly than any previous writer he shows how important it is to find out the real pronunciation behind the one that was considered to be correct. He quotes an interesting passage in illustration from Miège's *English Grammar* (1691) which distinguishes four sorts of pronunciation, viz. national, provincial, grave and familiar. 'The grave is properly used in grave and serious Discourses, and comes nearest the regular Way of Spelling.' Unluckily most of the grammarians like many 'teachers of elocution' were grave and serious men and their pronunciations are often pedantic and unnatural. At times acute analysis alone will reveal the natural or familiar pronunciation of a word, generally when the grammarian fails to be consistent with himself. Further there is the trouble that the grammarians were not trained phoneticians, being often quite unable to distinguish between diphthongs and digraphs (not 'diagraphs' as Dr Zachrisson so unfortunately writes it) or between sounds and symbols. Fortunately the other kinds of evidence are not tainted quite to the same degree. Many people were still quite ready, at least in private correspondence, to spell as they spoke, while the foreign language teachers were eager to get their pupils forward and so made rapid, if rather rough and ready, comparisons of the sounds of the two languages. Finally the author concludes that:

(1) The sound-changes to which our Present Standard pronunciation owes its characteristic features had commenced to operate as early as the 15th century.

(2) The pronunciation of Elizabethan English must have borne a strong resemblance to that of to-day.

(3) The present pronunciation was established towards the end of the 17th century.

(4) The theories (of Luick and others) as to two-fold developments of M. E. sounds in N. E. are largely untenable.

Dr Zachrisson must be congratulated on the excellence of his English, and his printers on the rarity of the misprints in a work crowded with detail of every kind. So far as it has proved possible to the reviewer under stress of present circumstances to examine the evidence adduced, only very rarely does the author make any mistake. On p. 80 *sonds* in *sonds of Dover* (Paston Letter 93) is clearly for *sands* and not for *sounds*. On p. 82 there is no need to query Richard Cely's *auffer* = offer, for that is certainly the word.

The book marks a real and definite advance in the study of the development of Standard English and it is to be hoped that Dr Zachrisson will continue to work on lines which have already proved so fruitful in his hands.

ALLEN MAWER.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

Notice du Manuscrit Français 12483 *de la Bibliothèque Nationale.* Par M. ARTHUR LÅNGFORS. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale. 1916. 167 pp.

In this publication (printed as a separate volume from *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits, etc., Tome* XXXIX, 2^e^ *partie*), M. Långfors has given us in an accessible form a detailed analysis of a manuscript which has been frequently described and the greater part of which has already been published[1]. The manuscript is a notable one. It forms, as M. Paul Meyer has said, 'une espèce de poème moral' in honour of the Virgin Mary, and its component parts furnish an extraordinary variety and wealth of material for a collection of this kind. The author, or rather the compiler, was a man of extensive reading and the analysis of M. Långfors enables us to pass in review the numerous sources which he has laid under contribution in the course of his work and also to detect the hand of the author when he ceases to quote from others and contributes something of his own. The composition of the manuscript has been described more than once (cf. Raynaud, Naetebus, etc.); it consists of two books each containing originally fifty chapters, not all of which have been preserved. These chapters all follow more or less the same plan—first the description of an animal, a plant, a stone, or a 'thing' with moral interpretation and application to the Virgin; then a 'conte dévot' (sometimes two), in most cases a miracle of the Virgin the source of which is generally indicated by the author of the manuscript,—then, to conclude the chapter, some form of 'lai' or 'dit,' either pious or profane, drawn from the most varied sources and often connected with what has gone before by means of a few introductory lines from the pen of the compiler himself. The original work of the author of the manuscript, as M. Långfors points out, can be identified by the marginal indication: *Ros'* or *Rosari'* (i.e. *Rosarius*), an epithet of doubtful interpretation. The sources which the author of the manuscript had at his disposal were evidently numerous. All the well-known Latin collections of *exempla* have been laid under contribution: the *Vies des Pères*, Césaire d'Heisterbach, Vincent de Beauvais, Étienne de Bourbon, and the *Apiarium* or *Livres des aés* of Thomas de Cantimpré to whom M. Långfors attributes no less than six of the miracles found in the manuscript. He might probably have added a seventh, as the 'conte' entitled 'du pecheur a cui la teste coupee joinst au cors, se confessa par les merites Nostre Dame' (Ch. xl, Bk II, of which only the heading is preserved), is doubtless an adaptation of the miracle in Thomas de Cantimpré (Liber II, cap. xxix), 'De capite abscisso confitenti et de ieiunio feriae quartae et sabbati in honorem beatae Mariae Virginis.'

---

[1] See Jubinal, *Nouveau Recueil de contes, dits et fabliaux* t. II, p. 413 f.; Raynaud, *Romania* XIV, 442 f.; Naetebus, *Die nicht-lyrischen Strophenformen*, Einl. p. vi.

M. Långfors has reproduced *in extenso* several poems which have either escaped other editors or hitherto been only published in part. Some of these poems present features of interest. The latter part of Ch. xxxii, Bk I, is occupied by a poem entitled 'Des .v. vegiles'—a poem of 53 quatrains exclusively devoted to the cult of the Virgin. The last part of it however is to be found almost verbatim in a work of a very different description entitled *Art d'amours* by a certain Guiart (cf. *Histoire Littéraire de la France* XXIII, 291 and XXIX, 472). M. Långfors gives also the text of Guiart's poem (unpublished hitherto) and thus provides us with another example of the extraordinary mixture of the sensual and the divine which made possible the moralization of such works as the *Ars Amatoria* and the *Remedia amoris* of Ovid. Another poem here edited for the first time forms the concluding part of Ch. vi, Bk II. Under the heading 'un dyalogue du sage et du fol' we have a poem consisting of 40 quatrains of alexandrines which M. Långfors describes as 'une sorte de tenson entre un sage et un fol.' The form is familiar, as reasoning in dialogue form was popular both in France and Germany in the 14th century, and the aversion of the worldling to paradise where:

> Il n'i va fors que vieles et que vilains bossus
> Et mesiaus et contrais et gent de tel refus,

and his question:

> I vestent beles dames ne le ver ne le gris?

inevitably recall the well-known passage in *Aucassin et Nicolete.*

The author of the collection is sparing of information as to his own identity, but M. Långfors concludes with good reason that the MS. dates from the second quarter of the 14th century, and that the author was a 'Frère-Précheur de l'ordre de saint Dominique' and a native of Soissons. A great traveller and a zealous preacher, he tells us himself that he has not always found his profession an easy one:

> Souvent ai hurté a tel porte
> Ou charité ert dedens morte.

If not a great poet himself he was an industrious collector, and his work contains much that is of interest to the student of the Mary-literature of that period. M. Långfors has performed a real service in making the contents of the manuscript better known.

JESSIE CROSLAND.

LONDON.

Obras de Lope de Vega publicadas por la Real Academia Española. (Nueva Edición.) Obras Dramáticas. [Edited by D. EMILIO COTARELO Y MORI.] Tomo I. Madrid, 1916. Sm. fol. pp. xiv + 716.

The intention of the Spanish Academy to issue a popular and cheaper edition of the dramatic works of Lope de Vega is an excellent one. The huge folio volumes of the edition edited by the late Sr. Menéndez y Pelayo are very heavy, unwieldy and expensive. This new issue is of smaller format and is printed on thinner paper, which makes the handling much more convenient, while the price (ten pesetas) is such as to bring the volumes within the reach of all students of the Spanish drama.

The Academy has, moreover, again been fortunate in the choice of an editor. It is a question whether there is a scholar living more competent than the distinguished secretary of the Academy, Sr. Cotarelo, to whom this task has been entrusted. Truly, the undertaking is a stupendous one, and the question naturally arises, will the new editor be able to complete it? Menéndez y Pelayo, with an almost unlimited capacity for work, lived to see thirteen volumes through the press, and two appeared after his death. Let us hope that a better fortune awaits the new editor, and that he may accomplish the great task that he has undertaken. Everything has been done, in fact, to insure the speedy appearance of the succeeding volumes. The classification of Lope's plays, which was attempted by Menéndez y Pelayo, has been abandoned, the chief aim of the editor being, as stated in the *prólogo*, to publish all the dramatic works of Lope de Vega extant, giving preference, in the earlier volumes, to the rarer or hitherto unknown works of the author, so that within an appreciable period of time the whole dramatic output of the great *Fénix* may be made accessible.

This primary object of Sr. Cotarelo,—to publish every play of Lope de Vega's,—those undoubtedly authentic, as well as the supposititious pieces,—should always be borne in mind in considering the volumes of this new edition. We agree entirely with Sr. Cotarelo that, before everything else, we want all the plays of Lope in print. To insure this being done within measurable time precludes long delay and scrupulous deliberation on the part of the editor. His task is entirely different from that of the editor of a single play. No scholar could hope, within the space of an ordinary lifetime, to accomplish the task which Sr. Cotarelo has set himself, did he ponder over the text, scrutinize every syllable and weigh every comma, as the editor of a single play may do. He must decide quickly; he must work with dispatch, and, being human, he is bound to commit errors. Time is an important factor in such a task. Through delay, during the past few years, at least ten plays ascribed to Lope de Vega have been lost to us, owing to the unaccountable disappearance of the three *tomos colecticios* of the Osuna library. The energy shown by Sr. Cotarelo thus far, is a promise that all the dramatic works of Lope de Vega will be accessible to the student within a measurable time. Down to the present moment three volumes, containing sixty plays, have appeared. We are concerned here only with the first volume.

While students of the Spanish drama have been looking forward to the appearance of this new edition, few can have anticipated the surprise caused by the publication of this first volume. For it contains twenty-one plays, all of which only existed in manuscript, and most of which had been considered as lost. Of these twenty-one plays no less than sixteen were discovered by Sr. Cotarelo in the King's private library, and all of these sixteen are works of Lope's early years, i.e. they apparently belong to the period previous to 1598. The plays in the first volume are the following: *Los Amores de Albanio y Ismenia; Las Burlas de Amor; Los Contrarios de Amor; El Galán escarmentado; El Ganso de Oro; El Hijo Venturoso; La Infanta desesperada; Las Justas de Tebas y Reina de las Amazonas; El Mesón de la Corte; El Premio riguroso y Amistad bien pagada; El Príncipe melancólico; El prodigioso Príncipe Transilvano; El Rey fingido y Amores de Sancha; Santo Ángelo; La Venganza piadosa; El Grao de Valencia; El Alcaide de Madrid; Alejandro el Segundo; Amar por Burla; Antonio Roca* and *Arminda celosa.*

The first play *Los Amores de Albanio y Ismenia* is wholly unknown, not being mentioned in either of the lists of Lope's *Peregrino en su Patria* of 1603 or 1618. The similarity of the play, a pastoral drama, to the undoubted play *La Pastoral de Jacinto*, published in Part XVIII of Lope's *Comedias*, speaks strongly for Lope's authorship. There is scarcely any action in the play, which, moreover, is almost devoid of plot, but shows much of the inimitably fluent and graceful versification for which Lope is famous.

Las Burlas de Amor is cited in the first list (1603) of the *Peregrino*. It differs entirely from *Las Burlas veras*, which is undoubtedly Lope's (published by Rosenberg, Philadelphia, 1912), and is also different from *Las Burlas veras* by the Salamancan D. Julián de Armendariz, of which there is a MS. (not an autograph, apparently) in the Biblioteca Palatina at Parma. As Sr. Cotarelo notes, *Las Burlas de Amor* has all the freshness and facility observable in the works of Lope's youth, and the characters, especially the women, 'aparecen ya diseñados con aquel esmero y dulce afecto que luego constituyeron sus mayores excelencias como dramaturgo.' It is a delightful play, though with a most improbable plot; in fact nearly all the plots of these early plays lack plausibility. P. 56, col. 1, l. 3 from foot, read 'barbaras'(?) for 'bancaras': in the following line read: 'hizo temblar, de Agrijento Hiero.'

The third comedia, *Los Contrarios de Amor*, is neither mentioned in the lists of the *Peregrino*, nor is it ascribed to Lope in any known catalogue, and here we must register our scepticism as to the authenticity of this play. It is true that the manuscript ascribes the play to Lope, but it can scarcely be doubted that it is not his. It is a halting, dragging piece of work with a puerile plot,—the story of a King of England who is a confirmed woman-hater, and of a Queen of Scotland who despises men, and who, of course, finally marry each other. Lope in his most unfortunate moments could scarcely have written such verses as these:

Rey: En esto estriba mi gusto,
Erbagio; yo gusto de esto,
y pues yo de aquesto gusto
mostrad el pecho dispuesto
a darme gusto en lo justo. (p. 80.)

Or these:

Que ésta a los hombres persigue,
yo a las mugeres, y pues
también ella muger es,
también mi furia la sigue. (p. 81.)

Or these:

Erbagio: Ya, mi bien, se llega el plazo
de dar la lazada al lazo
que las dos almas enlaza;
pues un lazo las enlaza,
abrácelas un abrazo. (p. 84 a.)

El Galán escarmentado, though attributed in the MS. to Guillén de Castro, is mentioned in the *Peregrino* (1603), and is certainly Lope's. In it he refers to the expedition to the island of Terceira (1583), by the Marqués de Santa Cruz (died in February 1588). The play was doubtless written shortly after 1588, for it mentions Thomas de Granvela, nephew of the great Cardinal, as already deceased (p. 133). Granvela died in 1588 (Pérez Pastor, *Proceso*, p. 135). In *El Galán escarmentado* Lope alludes to two other plays of his (p. 136): *La Serrana de Placencia*, which is probably the same as *La Serrana de la Vera* and *La comedia de Muza*. The *Peregrino* list of 1603 contains two plays on the subject of Muza, both now lost. Two other comedias are mentioned: *El Pródigo* and *Cañamor*, both unknown to me[1]. P. 119, l. 12, read Don Juan Manrique.

---

[1] The latter play is probably founded on the romance of chivalry *La Historia del Rey Cañamor y del infante Turián su hijo y de las grandes aventuras que ovieron*, Sevilla, 1528; see Menéndez y Pelayo, *Antología de Poetas líricos*, Tomo IX, p. 230, and *Libros de Caballerías*, ed. Gayangos, p. lxxviii.

El Ganso de Oro certainly adds nothing to Lope's reputation. This play, with a wildly improbable plot, takes its name from the promise of a King to give a golden goose for every goose lost by Lisena, a herder. The characters Belardo, a shepherd, and Belisa, a shepherdess, seem to indicate that this is a very early play,—before 1588. A much better play is *El Hijo Venturoso*, Venturoso being the name of the protagonist. It is mentioned in the *Peregrino* list of 1603; years afterward, as Sr. Cotarelo says, Lope, forgetful of this play of his early years, rewrote it with the title *La Esclava de su Hijo*, and it is found under this name in the list of 1618. The latter play, still inedited, is to appear in one of Sr. Cotarelo's succeeding volumes.

La Infanta desesperada, mentioned in the list of 1603, is, as the editor says: 'comedia novelesca en grado sumo,' in which the heroine attempts suicide, 'recurso dramático muy poco frecuente en nuestro teatro del siglo XVII.' The character of Lavinia is beautifully drawn, and the passages between her and her son, in the third Act, are full of pathos. Impossible as the action is, the play holds the interest of the reader from beginning to end, and must have been successful on the stage. The appearance of Belardo (pseudonym of Lope) and Belisa (anagram of Isabel [de Urbina]) indicate the early date of this play. *Las Justas de Tebas y Reina de las Amazonas* Sr. Cotarelo conjectures to be a re-cast of *Las Amazonas*, a work of Lope's youth, which he mentions in the list of 1603. The editor thinks, moreover, that *Las Justas de Tebas* may be the play cited in the same list as *La Abderite*, inasmuch as the Queen of the Amazons is named Abderite in *Las Justas*. On page 250, col. 2, l. 17, instead of 'Si en ti daba la Princesa,' read: 'Sentida va la Princesa.' There is an interesting passage in this play (p. 261, col. 2), where the scene is supposed to change, though there is nothing to indicate this change except the words of the speaker. Evandro, being alone on the stage, says:

> Llevándome del furor,
> hablando de mi señor,
> poco a poco y de mi espacio,
> he llegado hasta Palacio.
> Dél sale el embajador.

And the stage-direction follows: *Sale el Embajador*, etc.

El Mesón de la Corte is a delightful comedy, the entire action of which passes in an inn. On page 281, l. 16 of Pedro's speech, read: 'dejé casa de un noble padre'; l. 18 read: 'que en mala ocasion'; l. 26, read: 'que abrazos' (?); p. 284, l. 26, read: 'Cómo en alcagüete das?' p. 293, b, l. 7, from foot of page, 'esturdión' = 'turdión,' a dance.

El Premio riguroso y Amistad bien pagada, Sr. Cotarelo conjectures, may be the comedia *Las gallardas Macedonias*, mentioned in the list of 1603, and otherwise unknown. Excelsa and Leonora are daughters of the king of Albania, a territory that formed part of ancient Macedonia. Despite its unconvincing plot, the play interests and no doubt charmed contemporary theatre-goers.

El Príncipe melancólico is the story of a prince who feigns madness in order to gain the Duquesa Rosilena, who is in love with his brother Leonido. Page 338, ll. 15—18, read: 'Ya no mirar a mi padre, cuyo respeto me fuerza, quedará, a quedar por fuerza, tan muerto como mi madre.' Such rhymes as *pasa*: *traza*; *reposo*: *gozo*; *firmeza*: *empresa*, not uncommon in Andalucian poets, are never found in Lope de Vega's verses to my knowledge. And yet the play is noted in the list of 1603. Some other hand has evidently been at work here. That poor Murcian, Claramonte, is the universal scape-goat in such cases. Has he, perhaps, recast this play? In any event, it is of little moment, as it is a poor work. We must, at least, give Claramonte the credit of knowing a good play when he saw it, and, perhaps, free him of any suspicion in this case.

El prodigioso Príncipe Transilvano is a work far exceeding in length the ordinary comedia of Lope, containing about five thousand lines. Schaeffer republished it from an old print, which ascribes it to Luis Vélez de Guevara (*Ocho Comedias desconocidas*, Leipzig, 1887), but the variants from the manuscript are so many that Sr. Cotarelo decided to reprint it. The editor makes out a fair case for Lope's authorship of this play. Many of the manuscript readings can be amended by the help of Schaeffer's text.

El Rey fingido y Amores de Sancha, to quote Sr. Cotarelo, 'is cited as anonymous in the *Catálogo* of Medel del Castillo, which statement Huerta repeats; Mesonero Romanos attributes it to Lope, without giving a reason, and Barrera cites an anonymous comedia with the title *Amores de Sancha y Rey fingido.* As this is not sufficient to form a safe judgment, the comedia remains doubtful, so far as its ascription to Lope de Vega is concerned.' The manuscript from which it is here published, ascribes it to Lope. The play is noted as 'doubtful' in the writer's *Bibliography of the Dramatic Works of Lope de Vega*, p. 234, and we can now say, almost without hesitation, that it is not Lope's. The versification does not bear the slightest resemblance to the style of Lope; it is generally wooden and mechanical. A few passages will suffice to show this:

> *Paje:* Por ti invía el Rey, señora,
> porque llega ya el Rey cerca,
> y viendo que está tan cerca
> y que se llega la hora,
> quiere que estés tú con él
> al tiempo de recibillo. (p. 425 b.)

Or this:

> *Duque:* Venga un sacerdote al punto,
> Rey, que estoy tan deseoso
> ser ya de tu hija esposo,
> que no quiero perder punto. (p. 426 a.)

Or this:

> *Rey:* Amigo, ¡que he de morir;
> que ya no puede ser menos!

Marques: Es el extremo, a lo menos,
a que has podido venir.
Pero no, no morirás,
que el Rey te guardará ley,
y cuando esto no haga el Rey,
aún bien, que en mi mano estás. (p. 429 b.)

The poverty of the rhymes is striking; *Portugal* rhymes always (at least ten times) with *mal.*

Santo Ángelo is probably, as the editor surmises, the play cited in the list of 1618 as *San Angel, Carmelita.* It is Lope's, undoubtedly, but the text is exceedingly corrupt, and has called forth many excellent emendations on the part of Sr. Cotarelo, though it is still unsatisfactory in a number of passages.

La Venganza piadosa, a hitherto unknown play, is ascribed in the manuscript to Lope, and is here printed on the authority of that ascription. The versification is easy and fluent and it may well be one of Lope's early plays, though it surely adds nothing to his reputation. Page 489 b, l. 29 should read: 'Alá mi misma venganza.'

El Grao de Valencia is an excellent play, adorned with all the richness of Lope's verse; 'recuerdo, a no dudar, de la prima residencia que Lope hizo en Valencia'; he mentions the Plaza de la Olivera, where the theatre was then situated. This is the last of the plays discovered by Sr. Cotarelo in the King's library.

El Alcaide de Madrid is edited from the Osuna manuscript in the Biblioteca Nacional; it is mentioned in the list of 1603. There can be no doubt that this is Lope's play; it is, as the editor says, 'the first model of a series of plays from Rojas Zorrilla to García Santisteban which have for their subject the well known and dramatic legend of the daughters of Gracián Ramírez.' For this play, see the article by Gómez Ocerín in the *Revista de Filología española,* III, p. 185. Page 568 a, l. 36, read: 'por camino tan aciago' (?).

Alejandro el Segundo is mentioned in the list of 1618 as *la de Alejandro,* while the next play *Amar por Burla* in its present condition is, in the opinion of the editor, probably a re-cast of Lope's play by another poet 'menos espontáneo.' The geography of *Alejandro el Segundo* is slightly confused: Scotland and Albania are contiguous countries (p. 604), and the King of Albania is represented as having paid tribute to the King of Scotland for some twenty years (p. 589).

Antonio Roca is the story of a monk, who, on account of an insult to his mother, becomes the leader of a robber band, but finally dies in the odour of sanctity. It is full of action and must have been popular in its day. It is here printed from an Osuna manuscript, the last act of which is a re-cast by Lanini. Lord Holland possessed a manuscript (whether an autograph or copy is uncertain), the whereabouts of which is unknown.

The title of the last play in the volume, *Arminda celosa,* is noted in the second list of the *Peregrino* (1618). Upon the MS., which belonged to Durán, is the following legend: 'Comedia por el Caballero Lisardo, cuya acción pasa en Madrid en 1622.' Durán, moreover, notes that the play is by Lope de Vega, and that this manuscript is a 'copy of the autograph of 1622.' As the play was mentioned in the list of 1618, there is an obvious error here. But the play raises another very interesting question. As just observed, the MS. ascribes the comedia to the *Caballero Lisardo.* Now *Lisardo* is the pseudonym of Lope de Vega's friend, D. Luis de Vargas Manrique, brother of the Condesa de Siruela, Doña Isabel Manrique de Vargas (Pérez Pastor, *Proceso de Lope de Vega por Libelos*, etc., pp. 41, 197). Sr. Cotarelo says (p. XIV): 'Lope empleó alguna vez el seudónimo de Lisardo.' We do not dispute this, though we cannot recall a single undoubted instance in which Lope used this name. It is true that our only authority for stating that *Lisardo* is Luis de Vargas, is the anonymous annotator of the ballad beginning 'Mirando estaba Lisardo,' in a copy of the *Romancero General* of 1604, in the Biblioteca Nacional. This annotator alludes to the early death of Don Luis: 'que en breves años malogró grandes esperanças.' Sr. Cotarelo returns to the subject in the introduction to Volume III, quoting Luis de Salazar (*Casa de Lara*, II, 354), who says of D. Luis de Vargas: 'Se halló en la jornada de Inglaterra, y pasando después a Italia, se anegó en el Golfo de León, sin dejar hijos.' Lope de Vega in his *Laurel de Apolo*, Silva IV, also alludes to him as 'aquel mancebo ilustre y desdichado,' proving that he died young. Sr. Cotarelo shows that D. Luis de Vargas was, in all probability, born in 1566. This is additional evidence that the note in the manuscript: 'Compuesto por el Caballero Lisardo; pasa en Madrid, año de 1622,' is erroneous, since D. Luis must have died long before this date; in fact, as Sr. Cotarelo says, he was probably no longer living in 1599. If the name *Lisardo* appeared on the manuscript from which Durán's copy was made, we are driven to the conclusion that, in this instance, Lope must have used the pseudonym *Lisardo* instead of his usual one *Belardo.* There are, moreover, two plays: *La próspera Fortuna de D. Bernardo de Cabrera* and *La adversa Fortuna de D. Bernardo de Cabrera*, both of which are declared, in the concluding verses, to be the work of *Lisardo.* The latter of these plays, an excellent tragedy, is published by Sr. Cotarelo as Lope's in the third volume of his edition. It certainly bears all the marks of being a genuine work of Lope's, but the mystery remains why Lope should have adopted this pseudonym.

The volume concludes with a list of 'Erratas, adiciones y enmiendas' to which further additions are made at the close of the second volume. A few corrections have been noted above, but much still remains to be done. Nor is this surprising. As already observed, the material is too vast to be sifted by a single editor. The additions and corrections furnished by Professor Restori to the thirteen volumes of the edition of Lope by Menéndez y Pelayo fill a good-sized octavo. Here, too, there is plenty of work for future editors who can subject the separate plays to intensive study.

It is to be hoped that Sr. Cotarelo will publish first those comedias of Lope de Vega's that are scattered in various exceedingly rare volumes accessible only in a few of the great public libraries. The editor's intention also to print the plays of disputable authenticity will certainly meet with hearty approval, and will help to clear up many a doubtful point in the bibliography of Spain's greatest dramatist. We wish the learned editor all success in his arduous undertaking.

HUGO A. RENNERT.

PHILADELPHIA, U.S.A.

Caractères généraux des Langues germaniques. By A. MEILLET. Paris: Hachette. 1917. xvi + 222 pp.

This little volume consists, in fact, of a classification of the features—phonological, morphological, syntactical and lexicographical—which are peculiar to the Germanic branch of the Indo-germanic family of languages. We say in fact, because the Introduction holds out a promise of greater things: 'mais ce qu'il convient de rechercher avant tout, ce sont les tendances qui dirigent le développement; il faut reconnaître, pour ainsi dire, les principes actifs du changement.' It is a fascinating theme, and we can only regret that in the sequel we are told so little of these directing tendencies.

M. Meillet holds that the Germanic languages are further removed from the Indo-germanic original than is any other group of the family. It is a somewhat sweeping generalisation, the more so since no standard of comparison is indicated upon which one might base such a conclusion. But be this as it may, the cause of this special and extreme divergence of Germanic from the original stock is to be found, according to M. Meillet, in the fact that a non-Indo-germanic people accepted a dialect of the Indo-germanic speech and at the same time preserved its former 'habitudes articulatoires.' This view is an application of the theory that language development is due to race-mixture, and its one-sidedness must be combated on more than one ground. It is true of course that a people accepting the language of its conquerors will speak that language in a modified form, and will substitute familiar for unfamiliar sounds; but it does not necessarily follow that it will also substitute new meanings and a new syntax because of those 'habitudes articulatoires.' If it does the latter it is because it cannot force its acquired habits of thought into the verbal mould of the language of the conqueror.

But the chief objection to M. Meillet's theory is that such a cause of change as he mentions is a purely accidental one. Languages have changed where there have been no conquerors and no conquered, and indeed in the great majority of cases this particular cause is absent. That race-mixture is one of the principles active in the development of language can scarcely be doubted, in so far as such mixture brings in its train an exchange of ideas and a different mental outlook, which must find their expression in language. But languages change without any race-mixture, and it seems to us somewhat hardy, therefore, to attribute all the special features of the Germanic languages to such a single cause.

After the brief introduction in which the view discussed above is put forward there follow three main sections in which there are placed before the reader in broad outline and clear perspective the most marked characteristics of Germanic phonology, morphology and vocabulary. The whole constitutes an exceedingly clear and interesting presentation of the material, and we are grateful to have it collected for the first time. Under the heading *Phonétique* there is a presentation of the First Sound Shifting, Verner's Law, the *Auslautsgesetze*, and a discussion of the fixing of the accent in Germanic. The section on *Morphologie* groups in convenient form the main stages in the breaking up of the original declensions and conjugations, and emphasises such novelties as the development of the weak verb etc. in Germanic. A final section deals very briefly with the vocabulary.

E. CLASSEN.

LONDON.

Gottfried Keller as a Democratic Idealist. By EDWARD FRANKLIN HAUCH. New York: Columbia University Press. 8vo. x + 96 pp.

The aim of Mr Hauch's dissertation is to deduce from Gottfried Keller's various contributions to periodicals, letters, poems, short stories and novels the growth of his ideas on politics, religion, education and art. He has handled his material skilfully, the facts are presented interestingly, lucidly and with a sense of style which makes good—as we note with pleasure—in the English renderings of the poems quoted; and the result is a book which presents in a more accessible form than any of the biographies Keller's thoughts on vital problems, which throws interesting side-lights on the way in which the stories grew out of Keller's deep interest in contemporary Swiss life and which will send even the reader who knows his Keller back to the *Grüne Heinrich* and the *Züricher Novellen* with a new zest. In politics Keller began as 'a vague revolutionary and raider *à tout prix*,' but gradually sobriety and thoughtfulness, enthusiasm joined to patience, courage united with mildness, optimism occasionally damped by anxiety, produced that type of democratic radicalism which forms the background to *Das Fähnlein der sieben Aufrechten*, and, in more sombre colours, to *Martin Salander*. He heartily disliked *Strebertum* as essentially undemocratic and often fatal to the individual. He is somewhat conservative in his attitude to women, who, in his opinion, have their own important work, but not in the actual management of the state. His ardent patriotism drew from him the declaration that he would take his old pistol and shoot a bullet through his head if the downfall or dismemberment of Switzerland by foreign aggression should come to pass. But he feels that 'the death of a nation, when it has served its time, is as natural as that of any individual.' The care of all, the development of every member of the nation and the exercise by that nation of its peculiar gifts for the good of humanity, would sum up pretty adequately Keller's political ideals. In religion he passed, under the influence of Feuerbach in Heidelberg, from the stage of clinging to a positive, even if mystic element in religion, from an unwillingness to sacrifice the ideas of God and immortality, to a position, not of rationalistic denial, but of calm, optimistic renunciation. 'What,' he asks in 1850, 'is my attitude towards God? I have none! Ludwig Feuerbach and the Constitutionals in Frankfurt, besides some rudimentary physiological studies, have dissipated all my luxurious dreams.' Hauch combats the theory of Professor Walz, that Keller later in life returned to the religious views of his earlier years. There is no evidence of this in his writings. When we read his stories, we feel it is the service of mankind that is Keller's positive religion. As for faith, that must be left to the individual conscience of each human being.

On a subject covering so wide a field as education does, it is not easy to summarize a writer's views, especially if, as in Keller's case, education was one of his strongest interests. In many of his books, from *Der grüne Heinrich* to *Martin Salander*, in very many of his figures—we may mention Strabinski, Fritz Amrain, Jacques, Hadlaub, Meretlein—the question of the influence of education occupies almost the foremost place. Keller believes in the need for educational opportunities for all: training of character is more important than vocational efficiency: it is fatal to run all into the same rigid mould: teach patriotism, train the judgment, let moral instruction be practical, waiting for the opportune moment: use experience, nature's greatest teacher. As in religion, so in education, the service of mankind is the ultimate goal. The individual, to begin with, must be treated as an individual, but his final value, his highest service, will be as a member of the community in which he lives. Regarding art Keller attained clarity sooner than on the other points. As early as 1843 he opposed the view of the propagandists that the duty of art was to assist reform. It should certainly, Keller says, 'raise its voice for the people in distress and need': but afterwards it should be 'the flower-garden for life's recreation.' As to the question of realism, he does not find it irreconcilable with idealism. 'The same God,' he says, 'who gave poetry to man, also gave him, without doubt, the artistic impulse and the necessity for perfection.' Idealization is innate in the beauty of nature herself. He has no fears about the future of poetry, which some represented as threatened by industry, science and mechanical progress. In 1845 Justinus Kerner had written a poem deploring the possibility of even the air being appropriated and polluted by man's commercial needs. Keller replied with the gay stanzas (we give Hauch's translation as an example of his work):

In happy ages yet unborn,
Of aircraft, piled with Grecian wine,
High up beyond the redd'ning morn,
The steersman's place would I decline?
  As vine-crowned through the air I'd soar,
  Of Bacchus e'er the devotee,
  A brimming cup I'd slowly pour
  Into the wide, deserted sea!

We would suggest on p. 11, l. 22 'the new clang' instead of 'the new ring,' or a free translation. There are slight misprints on p. 23, l. 21; p. 42, l. 17; p. 44, l. 19. A concise bibliography, which might have been more extensive, rounds off an excellent piece of work.

JOHN LEES.

ABERDEEN.

More Tales by Polish Authors. Translated by ELSE C. M. BENECKE and MARIE BUSCH. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell. 1916. 8vo. 288 pp.

This second volume of Polish stories presents the work of some of the leading novelists of modern Polish literature. The style is uneven, but on the whole the Polish originals are accurately translated. The Polish greeting on p. 45 would be more exactly rendered 'Christ be praised.' Some explanation is wanted of names with which the English reader will be unfamiliar. Mazur for instance means an inhabitant of Mazovia, that part of Poland of which Warsaw is the capital and from which the Mazurka dance is derived. But the English reader will want to know something about the authors of these tales. Sieroszewski and Szymański are already known in this country for their stories about Siberia where so many Poles have lived in exile. But the name of Prus is practically unknown in England though Prus is one of the two great novelists of Poland.

The first half of the nineteenth century was in Poland an age of romanticism both in politics and in literature. It produced a number of armed risings, an idealistic philosophy and the great Polish romantic poetry and music. The failure of the insurrection of 1863 brought about a complete change, and there grew up the school of thought which became known as the Positivist school, which turned the minds of the Poles away from romanticism to practical work, industrial prosperity and a more practical outlook on life. Of these ideas Prus was one of the chief exponents. He turned from the glorification of the national past, armed revolution, the Napoleonic legend and dreams of the resurrection of Poland, to the actual life he saw around him, the factory, the peasant world. He satirizes the romantic cavalier of the former régime, his rhetoric and sentimentality, and presents the actual life of the peasant and the workman, and raises the man who acts over the man who feels. In his wide gallery of portraits from low life, his humanitarianism and his rich humour, his efforts at reforming by means of satire, he is a Polish counterpart of Charles Dickens, and his works played no small part in the revolution which turned the Polish community from international politics to social reform. His greatest work deals with the Polish peasant and his efforts to keep his land from the hands of the German colonists. But he wrote a number of short stories of which *The Returning Wave* is a fair specimen. His work is a complete contrast to that of his great contemporary Sienkiewicz who revived the past glories of Poland in his well-known historical novels; but the two authors are nearer one another in their short stories.

Żeromski is perhaps the greatest of the younger Polish writers. His work is remarkable for its deep pessimism. He paints life in the profoundest gloom against which only a strong will to live, a deep sense of the beautiful enables his heroes to prevail. Reymont, another young writer, has described the life of the Polish peasant, in an epic in prose which is one of the masterpieces of modern Polish literature. Although this series of short stories does not show us the Polish novelists in their greatest productions, it introduces us to most of the leading writers of fiction in some of their lesser works.

A. Bruce Boswell.

Liverpool.

MINOR NOTICES.

The Social Criticism of Literature, by Gertrude Buck, Professor in Vassar College (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford) sets forth in sixty pages the conflicting views taken of the function of literary criticism, and proposes a new view. There is the old 'judicial' criticism, based on Aristotle and Horace; the 'scientific' (better, perhaps, 'historical') criticism which is content to put a book in relation to the environment out of which it sprang without passing judgment on it; the 'impressionist' criticism which gives the book's effect on the mind of an individual reader: the 'appreciative' criticism which, by combining the results of the two last, attempts to fix the book's definite value; the 'æsthetic' criticism which appraises it by reference to the principles laid down in the modern science of æsthetics. Miss Buck thinks and writes clearly, and this part of her work will be found clarifying by her readers. On the value of the new view of literary criticism which she advances there may be a difference of opinion. To give it in her own words: 'Good literature as judged by the social standard is that which efficiently performs the function of literature for any individual or for any group of individuals, namely the function of making common in society all peculiar advantages of mental endowment or experience' (pp. 41, 42). Or again: 'The critic's social activity...seeks always to further the activity of literature as an agent of social progress, by applying to every concrete problem presented to it the principle that literature is not only a creature, but also a creator of the society it serves' (p. 60). We gather that according to Miss Buck some books may have a literary value for a particular age—perhaps even for a particular individual, while others may have value for a wide number in all ages. But the test of the book is to be its social utility. We recommend our readers however to read Miss Buck for themselves.

G. C. M. S.

Hazlitt's *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays* (H. Milford, 1916) is a worthy addition to the *World's Classics.* Hazlitt has long taken his place among the great critics of Shakespeare, and this reprint of his *Characters* fitly appears just a century after their first publication. The Introduction by Sir Arthur Quiller Couch is admirable. We quite agree with him where he writes—'No one not a fool can read Johnson's notes on Shakespeare without respect, or fail to turn to them again with an increased trust in his common-sense, as no one not a fool can read Hazlitt without an equal sense that he has the root of the matter, or of the spirit which is the matter.' Equally just is his treatment of the main characteristic of these criticisms, which are imaginative impressions rather than intellectual studies:—'The first qualification of a critic—at any rate of a critic of poetry—is...to *feel* rather than to *know*;...to be delicately sensitive and sympathetic counts more than to be well-informed; nevertheless learning remains respectable; it...improves and refines his feelings while enlarging their scope.' I could wish that Sir A. Quiller Couch had added what I believe to be the whole truth, namely, that the supreme qualification for a critic of poetry is to be himself a poet.

Among the best examples of Hazlitt's criticism is that of the Poems of Shakespeare; he was the first, I believe, to call attention to their comparative artificiality; and he is not far from the truth when he attributes this lack of naturalness to their undramatic character. 'It was only by representing others that he became himself,' or we might add, what Goldsmith wrote of Garrick, ''Twas only that, when he was off, he was acting.' This fact, however, should be stated, that whereas in his dramas Shakespeare's attempts to be lyrical were mostly successful, in his poems, on the other hand, his attempts to be dramatic were mostly unsuccessful.

M. L.

Those of us who have felt bewildered by the flood of Shakespearian literature and criticism of the past tercentenary year will welcome Professor G. L. Kittredge's Harvard address *Shakspere* (Harvard University Press, 1916) with its strong and sensible plea for a steady yet open-minded outlook upon Shakespearian problems. Especially valuable is his dictum that there can be no absolute interpretation of Shakespeare's characters: which, like living beings, must appear in different lights to different people. So is the distinction which Professor Kittredge draws between the function of the critic and that of the poet who elaborates some of Shakespeare's hints, such as that about 'Childe Roland's Tower.' The former must be very careful not to read into a speech or a play what he is not certain is there.

These are only illustrations of the wealth of striking reflections on the tendencies of the less restrained critics of Shakespeare which are contained in this address. Among so much that is sound and moderate, we find Professor Kittredge too sweeping when he says that 'almost everything which has been written about the drama of Hamlet is out of focus'; or sums up the motif of the play as 'a duel to the death between Hamlet and the King': the great predominance given by Shakespeare to Hamlet's words and actions seems to negative this, and the single line in which the King's end is described hardly gives him the position of a protagonist.

H. O.

The *Shaksperian Studies,* contributed by members of the Department of English and Comparative Literature in Columbia University and edited by Professors Brander Matthews and A. H. Thorndike (New York: Columbia University Press, 1916), are an interesting and valuable contribution to Shakespearian criticism. Especially notable is the first study of the series, which gathers together some of the stage traditions connected with different dramas, and gives us an idea of the value which would attach to further work in this field. 'The devoted student,' says Professor Matthews, 'who dwells remote from theaters...does not suspect how much more varied and colored and moving these plays are when their characters are sustained by flesh and blood performers, when the words take a new magic by the modulated tones of the human voice, and when the action is...illuminated by the appropriate by-play.' Several studies contribute to show the enormous educational influence exercised by Shakespeare. A long paper on 'Shakespeare's Personality' comes to the somewhat original conclusion that it is possible that the poet's personality was not of a very interesting type. The writer shows so much erudition, that one might have hoped his investigations would have ended in something better than the negative conclusion that the diverse conceptions of Shakespeare's character cancel one another as in an algebraic sum. In the papers that deal with individual plays many new points are made which at least throw a light on American ways of thought. In that on *Henry V,* we cannot help feeling that the critic looks for a strain higher than the dramatist intended. For example on p. 325 the hackneyed criticism is made that the King's boisterous humour in wooing shows a falling off in true kingly courtesy. But why may not Henry, like other great men, be allowed his lighter moments? It is also strange that in this somewhat minute study no reference at all is made to a scene which illustrates one of the most striking sides of Henry's character, that in which he condemns the conspirators. Shakespeare's marvellous gift for delineating complex characters is excellently brought out in a most suggestive study on 'The Reality and Inconsistency of Shakespeare's Characters.' But it is impossible to refer to all the studies in this remarkable volume.

H. O.

Mr Hubert Ord's little book *London shown by Shakespeare; and other Shakespearean Studies* (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1916), contains a collection of six Shakespearean studies, some of which have already appeared in *The Times* and *The Contemporary Review.* The first essay is an attempt to give an impression of London as it was in Shakespeare's day, as far as possible in the dramatist's own words, and is illustrated by an interesting map. The most ambitious, however, is an essay entitled 'A source of Shakespeare's Sonnets,' in which the author rejects the theory that in the Sonnets we have a revelation of Shakespeare's own thoughts and feelings, and puts forward the ingenious suggestion that Shakespeare derived the main topic of the Sonnets from Chaucer's translation of the *Roman de la Rose.* The Dark Lady and the Friend are explained as being personifications of Love and Friendship, while the Rival Poet is the writer of the 'antique book,' the *Roman de la Rose.* The theory, however plausibly it may be presented, is somewhat far-fetched. Mr Ord also touches lightly upon the topics of 'The Child and Education in Shakespeare,' 'Shakespeare and Dancing,' 'Shakespeare and Elocution' and 'Shakespeare's Educational Influence.'

F. E. H.

José Valentim Fialho de Almeida (1857–1911) on whom the following publications have recently appeared: *Fialho de Almeida. In Memoriam.* Organizado por Antonio Barradas e Alberto Saavedra (Porto, 1917); *A Linguagem Medica Popular de Fialho.* Por Alberto Saavedra (Porto, 1916); *Fialho d' Almeida.* Pelo Visconde de Villa-Moura (Porto, 1917), remains something of a conundrum in modern Portuguese literature. Although a reaction has set in to the great vogue he enjoyed during his life, he still has his fervent admirers, among whom, however, the majority of scholars are not included. The latter point out that he is deficient in imagination and psychology and that his merit consists in his descriptions, but that this merit is cancelled by his strange abuse of language. He followed up the lively *As Farpas* with his series of *Os Gatos,* but the mantle of Ramalho Ortigão did not sit very easily upon his shoulders; and although his collections of stories, *A Cidade do Vicio* (1882) and *O Paiz das Uvas* (1893), contain pages of undeniable power, there is scarcely a page in his works which is not deliberately or unconsciously ruined by the most unblushing gallicisms or extravagant neologisms. The study in a few pages entitled *Symphonia de Abertura* takes us, for instance, into the very heart of Portugal, but it is riddled with such words as *feerica, villegiatura, pantalonas, deboche.* It would seem that it had never occurred to him that a writer cannot use both French and Portuguese at once. Yet he was not a mere slave of French literature; he knew and admired the contemporary literature of Spain, he possessed the complete works of that most *castizo* of writers, Pereda, and we are told that he loved to wander through the Spanish cathedrals as he loved to explore remote parts of Portugal and the strange, narrow streets of old Lisbon. He wrote, he said, with "a violent pen," and he lived to regret the greater part of his social and political diatribes. Certainly he cannot be dismissed as a nonentity and the authors of the above works are therefore to be congratulated on having collected a considerable amount of new matter to throw more light on a writer who is said to have exercised so great an influence on his younger contemporaries. And no doubt if they are critical enough to be repelled by his style as well as by many of his subjects, they may derive some profit from his explosive energy.

A. F. G. B.

Those who are interested in the progress of Russian studies in this country will welcome Mr Nevill Forbes's volume of selections from Russian prose classics of the nineteenth century (*Third Russian Book*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1917). The accented text is accompanied with a vocabulary, and the numerous footnotes, which are models of terseness, contain references to the editor's *First* and *Second Russian Books*.

In their edition of Leo Tolstoi's three stories of the siege of Sevastopol (*Sevastopol*, Cambridge University Press, 1916) Messrs A. P. Goudy and E. Bullough have done a real service both to teachers and to learners of Russian in this country. For one thing, we have here 162 pages of accented Russian text in large clear type, enough for a session's reading in a class that has come through the initial difficulties of the grammar. The notes explain succinctly but interestingly idioms and popular forms not to be found in an ordinary dictionary. The Introduction in its 14 pages gives just what is necessary to understand the incidents narrated in the text, and there are some sound remarks on Tolstoi's characteristics as a story teller. A full vocabulary completes this useful edition.

In *Russian Lyrics* (Cambridge, University Press, 1917) Mr J. D. Duff prints twenty-five very short poems by 'classic' poets, such as Pushkin, Lermontov and others. The notes, which cover considerably more space than the text, are of an elementary character, being intended apparently for school use, and deal chiefly with points of grammar.

Among the smaller Russian dictionaries for English use that of J. H. Freese (Kegan Paul and Co., 1916) should prove serviceable to students. In both Russian-English and English-Russian parts it shows careful preparation, and the accentuation of every Russian head-word, so far as tested, is accurately carried out.

W. J. S.

VOLUME XIII APRIL, 1918 NUMBER 2

THE PARALLEL PLOTS IN 'HAMLET':

A REPLY TO DR W. W. GREG.

I.

AN HONEST GHOST.

Marcellus. We do it wrong, being so majestical,
To offer it the show of violence;
For it is, as the air, invulnerable,
And our vain blows malicious mockery.

DR GREG'S article, 'Hamlet's Hallucination,' printed in the *Modern Language Review* of October last, is a fascinating, far-reaching and extraordinarily ingenious piece of work. Arguing from an apparently weak spot in the dramatic structure of the play, he has produced a theory which, if true, forces us to recast completely our traditional conception of Shakespeare's intention, our time-honoured beliefs as to what actually took place in the palace of Elsinore, and—a point which has seemingly escaped his notice—our general ideas on the character of the prince of Denmark. On the other hand, whether we accept the theory or not, a consideration of it is bound to clear up points in the play which have hitherto been obscure, and to bring us nearer to a true understanding of the master-piece as a whole. In his attempt to look at the problem of *Hamlet* from an entirely new point of view, Dr Greg compels us to reconsider the bases of our faith, and provokes us to the healthy task of discussing the principles of dramatic criticism. In a word, he has given us a thorough shaking-up. For all this we are very deeply in his debt.

Clearly what started him off on his enquiry was a remarkable point in connexion with the dumb-show in the play-scene. How comes it that Claudius, who brings the play to a sudden end 'upon the talk of poisoning,' sits unmoved through the same scene when enacted in dumb-show a few minutes earlier? Further, if the dumb-show is strange, there are circumstances scarcely less strange about the actors' play itself. Hamlet's adaptation of the play extended to the insertion of 'a speech of some dozen or sixteen lines.' How was it that the players had in their repertory a drama which was in effect 'a minutely applicable representation of the affairs of the Danish court and of the alleged murder of the late king'? To assume that they had such a play is, surely, to make 'impossible demands upon the credulity of the audience.' The conclusions which Dr Greg draws from these anomalies are startling and at first reading overwhelming. They may be briefly summed up as follows:

(1) The King did not blench at the dumb-show for the simple reason that he did not recognise his own crime either in that or in the Gonzago play itself, which is mere verbal repetition of it.

(2) The information which the Ghost gives to Hamlet is, therefore, an incorrect version of what took place.

(3) Consequently the Ghost's speech must be interpreted as nothing but a figment of Hamlet's overwrought brain.

(4) And finally, the essential feature of the story (the poisoning through the ears) could only have taken root in Hamlet's mind through a sub-conscious memory of the very play which he afterwards employed 'to catch the conscience of the king.'

Thus baldly set out, the theory will perhaps seem far-fetched to those who have not read Dr Greg's own brilliant presentation of it. A dozen 'buts' rise at once to the lips. Dr Greg has foreseen them all, or nearly all, and has a reply to each, always suggestive and generally on the face of it convincing. Why has Shakespeare, deliberately it seems, deceived us in this way for three centuries? Dr Greg points out that Shakespeare is not likely to have himself believed in ghosts, that the Ghost in *Hamlet* is the only specimen in the plays for whose objective reality there is even plausible evidence, and that in this case Shakespeare allowed for a double interpretation—the groundlings should have the ghost they had paid for, while the 'judicious,' who sat on the stage or in the boxes, should have the subtle additional entertainment of knowing that the Ghost was really an hallucination. Or again, why did Claudius break up the gathering in the play-scene, if not because his conscience had been caught? Dr Greg comes forward with a highly interesting exposition of the whole scene worked out in great detail, to show that it was Hamlet's insufferable conduct and not the play at all which left the King so 'marvellous distempered.' Once more, if Hamlet was under the spell of his own imagination during his interview with the Ghost, what of its previous appearances, what of Marcellus, Bernardo, and Horatio the doughty sceptic?

Surely the evidence for the Ghost's reality is rather strong? Dr Greg does not deny this reality altogether. It is open for us to regard it 'as a freak of collective suggestion, and to explain it away as we should any other spook.' Marcellus and Bernardo were but credulous soldiers, who had already identified the apparition with the dead king before Horatio comes on the scene, upon what grounds we are not told, and their suggestion is passed on to Horatio, who accepts it uncritically, for all his previous scepticism. As for Horatio himself, on his own admission he had only seen the late king once, so that his testimony is valueless. Lastly, even suppose we cling obstinately to this 'poor ghost,' we may do so without its interfering with the main argument, provided we are ready to admit that the speech of the Ghost is subjective, as indeed we must if the play-scene is to have any dramatic logic at all.

It will be seen that, simple as the theory is in outline, Dr Greg has built up round it a very elaborate structure. On the other hand, the whole hypothesis, the construction of which occupies nearly thirty tightly packed pages of print, stands on a foundation which is strikingly slender. The stone which, ignored by all previous critics, Dr Greg makes the head-stone of his corner, is, dramatically considered, scarcely larger than a pebble. Once prove that the dumb-show business can be reconciled with the traditional interpretation of *Hamlet,* and the beautiful edifice, reared so patiently and ingeniously, falls toppling to the ground. This proof I hope to furnish at a later stage, after some preliminary mining and bombardment. One curious feature of Dr Greg's foundation-stone may, however, be noted at the outset.

The dumb-show, which occurs about a third of the way through Act III, is almost exactly the middle point of the play. Dr Greg's argument touches very slightly upon what happens in Acts IV and V, and in effect he is asking us, on the evidence of the dumb-show, in itself a brief incident enough, to revise all our impressions of what has taken place previously. Now Shakespeare undoubtedly aimed at coherence and continuity of general impression rather than at historical consistency. The play moves forward from scene to scene and from act to act, the spectator all the while absorbing new details which he builds up into the memory of all that has already happened. Surely if Shakespeare wished to give the 'judicious' section of his audience a clue, warning them not to accept the Ghost's word for a thousand pound, it is strange that he should have inserted it so late in the play. Let us imagine one of these judicious folk at a performance of *Hamlet.* The first act is almost exclusively concerned with the doings of the Ghost; it appears on three separate occasions, and more than 550 lines are devoted to it. At the end of all this our judicious gentleman, however much he may disbelieve in ghosts in the world of phenomena, can hardly avoid the conviction that, as far as the play is concerned, he must take this particular spook as an objective reality. This general impression he carries with him right through the second and part way through the third act. The hautboys play; the dumb-show enters, performs its pantomime and goes off; Claudius makes no sign of guilt. Does the spectator at once surrender his carefully built up impression of the Ghost's reality, recognise that the speech was an hallucination of Hamlet's brain, and conclude that the Gonzago story is the true origin of the whole business? It would be ridiculous to suppose it. Possibly he will be puzzled for a moment by the apparent indifference of the King, and in thinking over the scene afterwards may stumble upon what Dr Greg calls 'the second-tooth theory,' viz. that it took a double representation of his crime to force Claudius in horror to his feet. But while the play-scene is proceeding, one of the most exciting scenes in all Shakespeare, he has neither the time, the attention, nor a memory sufficiently precise of what has gone before, for his intellect to be capable of the elaborate ratiocinative process that Dr Greg's theory demands. He cannot turn back the pages or bid the actors stop while he thinks the matter out. He is forced to go on receiving new impressions, one of which, the King's consternation on the talk of poisoning, lays to rest any possible suspicions that may have arisen. Dr Greg complains, justly enough, that the commentators habitually fall into the 'mistake of criticizing drama as history.' Has he not also fallen into the same error? Not so, he replies, for *Hamlet* differs from Shakespeare's other plays, inasmuch as it was written for the closet not the stage, for the reader not the spectator. This is to beg the whole question of the relation between the First Quarto and the subsequent texts. But grant the point, admit that the play was written *first of all* by Shakespeare to be read, a large and generous admission, and we still have two questions to ask. The First Quarto was, in Dr Greg's words, 'undoubtedly based on an acting version,' why then does the dumb-show appear in it? Why did the players, who cut out so much else, retain this 'superfluous piece of business,' which on the orthodox interpretation, the only one possible for a spectator, 'not merely threatens the logical structure of one of the crucial scenes of the play, but reduces it to meaningless confusion[1]'? And again, if 'in reading and upon consideration' the dumb-show's 'absolute redundancy and its extraordinary results should immediately become apparent,' why has not a single one of Shakespeare's many thousand readers through the centuries ever drawn attention to the fact until October 1917? In seeking to prove that a brief piece of stage-business in the middle of Act III plays havoc with all the impressions conveyed in Act I, has not Dr Greg somewhat lightly set aside the principles of dramatic structure and the silent testimony of generations of readers and audiences?

---

[1] Personally I believe that Q_1 represents not merely an acting version but also an early draft of *Hamlet* by Shakespeare, a view which, if true, would make things still more awkward for Dr Greg.

Dr Greg starts with the play-scene and works backwards, thus reversing the dramatic order of events. Since the puzzle of the dumb-show forms the basis of his argument, it was for him the natural method of approach. Yet it was also a fortunate method, since he has to deal with the Ghost-scenes last of all, and this is far the weakest part of his argument. I propose to turn his argument round and take his points in Shakespeare's own order, since I believe this to be the only scientific line of approach in dramatic criticism.

Dr Greg deals many shrewd blows at the 'poor ghost' with his partisan; but I cannot think that there are even dints in the spectral armour, while it is certain that the Ghost with his truncheon has given as good as he got. One thing is clear. Whatever Shakespeare's own beliefs may have been, and whatever secret understanding he may have wished to establish with the 'judicious' among his audience, he took very great care indeed to make this ghost as real and as convincing as possible to the 'generality.' *Hamlet* opens as a ghost-story. The whole setting of the first scene, the midnight hour, the starlight, the ancient castle in the background, the handful of soldiers in the foreground who can barely see each other's faces, so dark is it, all this is deliberately calculated to throw the audience into that 'willing suspension of disbelief' which Shakespeare needed for his play. Marcellus and Bernardo have already seen the Ghost twice before, and have hardly begun to tell the tale once again to Horatio when the apparition glides on to the stage, only forty brief lines from the beginning of the play. Beforehand Horatio is represented as sceptical. Why? In order that he may be convinced against his daylight judgment and so help to convince the audience. The Ghost appears twice in the first scene. Why? In order that the impression may take firmer grip upon the audience. Its previous appearances to Marcellus and Bernardo are referred to three times in this scene and again in the next, when Horatio tells Hamlet that

> thrice he walk'd
> By their oppress'd and fear-surprised eyes,
> Within his truncheon's length.

Shakespeare simply hammers the point home. And note that all this occurs before Hamlet sees anything of the Ghost at all. Would not the ghost-believing 'generality' of Elizabethan times have swallowed the Ghost in *Hamlet* without all this pother? It would appear as if Shakespeare wished to do more than this, that in short he attempted to convince the 'judicious' also. Is it not possible indeed that he wished them to accept the Ghost as objective before Hamlet sees it, in order that they might not draw the very conclusion which Dr Greg has drawn, viz. that the Ghost, or at least the information it imparts, was the creation of Hamlet's disordered mind?

Dr Greg's way of discrediting the Ghost is to put all the persons who saw it through a sort of cross-examination. Marcellus and Bernardo are soon disposed of; they are ignorant and superstitious soldiers who had seen something and of course at once jumped to the conclusion that it is the spirit of the late King. 'As to the grounds of their belief we are in the dark.' Perhaps so. Yet if, as Horatio avers, the figure walked thrice by them 'within his truncheon's length,' they must have had plenty of opportunity of testing their belief. But these are Horatio's words, and Horatio is 'a very bad witness indeed.' He is no doubt 'cheerfully sceptical' when he comes on to the platform, but how quickly and how foolishly he gives way to superstitious suggestion when the 'spook' appears! Moreover his testimony is greatly weakened by his general inexactitude in other matters. He admits that he has only seen the late King once, and yet he is ready to swear—the 'simple, honest, and healthy, but not critical soul'—that the Ghost is he. Nay he even goes so far as to identify the Ghost's armour with that worn by Hamlet's father in the Norwegian wars, which occurred, as 'we have very good reason to believe,' when Horatio was a baby in arms! And as the poor honest, credulous fellow steps down from Dr Greg's witness-box, thoroughly discredited, we wonder whether it be not a crowning proof of Hamlet's madness that he should have selected this muddle-headed, unreliable rhetorician to tell his story and right his reputation in the eyes of the world. Yet before he leaves the court, there are one or two things we may say in his behalf. Possibly in this business of the armour and the 'sledded Polacks' he is merely repeating what he has heard from Marcellus and Bernardo, soldiers who must have known the late King's armour well and had perhaps fought with him in the Norwegian wars. Again, kings are persons well-known by sight, even to those of their subjects who have never seen them in the flesh. There were coins in Shakespeare's Denmark presumably. There were also pictures; and if people were ready to 'give twenty, forty, fifty, an hundred ducats a-piece for a picture in little', of the bloat-king, Claudius, how much more popular must have been the portrait of his brother, Hamlet.

> Hyperion's curls; the front of Jove himself;
> An eye like Mars, to threaten and command;
> A station like the herald Mercury,
> New-lighted on a heaven-kissing hill;
> A combination and a form indeed,
> Where every god did seem to set his seal,
> To give the world assurance of a man.

Thus his son describes him as he looks at one of these very portraits. Horatio may even have seen a copy of this self-same picture in his fellow-student's rooms at Wittenberg. And may not the scenes referred to in the 'armour' passage have been depicted in historical battle-pieces, which Horatio had examined in the royal picture-gallery during the interval between the funeral and the wedding? Moreover Horatio had seen the *face* of the Ghost, a point ignored by Dr Greg[1].

> *Hamlet.* Then saw you not his face?
> *Horatio.* O, yes, my lord; he wore his beaver up.
> *Hamlet.* What, looked he frowningly?
> *Horatio.* A countenance more in sorrow than in anger.
> *Hamlet.* Pale or red?
> *Horatio.* Nay, very pale.

After all this should it strain our credulity over-much to suppose that, although he had only seen the late King once, Horatio recognised him again as the Ghost? So we might argue, following Dr Greg's method, and in the end go bail for honest Horatio. And yet how idle all this speculation is! We are dealing with dramatic characters, not historical persons; and dramatic characters are not subject to cross-examination in the court of criticism. The only person we can put into the witness-box is one, William Shakespeare. The commentators, writes Dr Greg, inquire 'why Hamlet behaved in a ridiculous way, when the question they should have asked was why Shakespeare did—or whether he did.' The point at issue here is the same; it is not why did Horatio behave in this ridiculous way but why Shakespeare did—*or whether he did*. And the answer is obvious. Shakespeare makes Horatio talk about

---

[1] It may be asked: how did Horatio see the Ghost's face if the night was so dark that the soldiers could barely see each other? The reply is, of course, that in Shakespeare's theatre *Hamlet* would be performed in daylight and the audience would notice nothing inconsistent between the darkness, which is in the verse alone, and the visibility of the Ghost whose face, moreover, was probably in some way made luminous.

Norwegian wars, angry parles, sledded Polacks[1], and the rest of it, partly in order to bring in local colour, but chiefly to pile up the evidence for the Ghost's reality in the mind of the audience. And before the Ghost appears to Hamlet, Shakespeare has so hammered home his points that the evidence is overwhelming. It was essential to the whole purpose of the play that the audience should be in no doubt about this, for the problem of *Hamlet* is: why did not the Prince sweep to his revenge? It is a problem of character, not of circumstance. Once allow that Hamlet had valid excuse for his later suggestions that the Ghost 'may be the devil' or a 'damned ghost,' and the whole character-interest is weakened and confused, while the level of the play is lowered; what had been a spiritual problem becomes a spiritualistic one[2].

Before dealing with the scene in which the Ghost makes the all-important revelation to Hamlet, it will be convenient to say a word or two on the cellarage episode. 'Is it possible,' asks Dr Greg, 'to take "this fellow in the cellarage" seriously?...Frankly, it seems inconceivable that Hamlet should believe that, in "true-penny" and "old-mole," he is really addressing the spirit with whom he late had converse. But it is by no means easy to interpret the scene upon any other assumption.' Yes, if the scene be a difficult one for those who hold to the traditional interpretation, and we are free to admit that it is—for a modern audience—it is even more difficult for Dr Greg. In fact he finds it quite insuperable, and is forced to bring forward an explanation which he does not pretend is satisfactory, though 'it is at least as satisfactory as any other I can imagine.' Let us see what his explanation is.

---

[1] Dr Greg's 'very good reason' for believing that Horatio was a baby in arms when these events took place, is we suppose the grave-digger's statement in Act v, scene 1, that Hamlet, Horatio's fellow-student, was born on 'that day that our last king Hamlet o'ercame Fortinbras.' Such an argument is an excellent example of the dangers of criticising drama as history. The reference to 'ambitious Norway' and the 'sledded Polacks' occurs sixty lines from the beginning of the play. At that point we know nothing of Danish history or chronology, we have not even heard of the existence of Hamlet, and the period of the story has not yet been fixed. We therefore swallow Horatio's remarks without the slightest hesitation, use them to feed our growing impressions of the situation, and—since they have served their purpose, which is a purely transitory one—forthwith forget all about them. The grave-digger's remarks in Act v, *right at the end of the play*, are of equally transitory interest; and the spectator, or the average reader either for that matter, who could connect them with Horatio's speech and conclude that either he or the grave-digger must be a liar, would have a memory more than human. If only Shakespeare had realised that his plays would become museums of carefully assorted and ticketed facts, he might have written more cautiously—perhaps!

[2] The question of Hamlet's doubts about the Ghost is admirably dealt with by Professor Moorman in his 'Shakespeare's Ghosts' published in the *Modern Language Review* in April 1906. Dr Greg laments the fact that as far as his knowledge goes, there exists no 'comprehensive study of the supernatural in Shakespeare.' Had he turned back the files of the review in which he was writing to the first volume, he would have found in Professor Moorman's two studies all that he needed, and more than enough I fancy to have shown him the fallacy of his own hallucination-theory.

'Are we to regard the underground mutterings as some ventriloquistic prank of Hamlet's? One could believe a good deal of him after the "tables" speech, but hardly this. *Perhaps a more reasonable view would be that they are the chance moanings of the waves in the caverns beneath the platform, that Hamlet amuses himself by pretending that they are the voice of the Ghost, and that his companions, shaken by the experiences of the night, accept his interpretation in all seriousness.*' Where, in the name of Shakespeare, are we in all this? Are we sceptical members of the Psychical Research Society transported by some time-machine to the castle at Elsinore to investigate the occurrences at a séance, or are we spectators at a theatre watching an imaginative scene upon the boards? Clearly Dr Greg has forgotten, not only that Hamlet is a character in a play, but also that he is a figure upon a stage. Only one theory will fit the facts, i.e. that Shakespeare intended the mutterings to represent the voice of the Ghost; the text itself will admit of no other interpretation. When Shakespeare wrote '*Ghost.* Swear,' did he intend us to read '*roar of breakers*'?[1] And even supposing he had wished to allow of this alternative explanation, he must have made provision for it *on the stage.* Surely Dr Greg will not be so bold as to assert that there were caverns under the platform of Elsinore Castle and waves dashing into them in the Globe theatre! Once think of the Globe theatre indeed and the whole difficulty is solved; for though *we* may find it impossible to take 'this fellow in the cellarage' seriously, the Elizabethans most assuredly did not. To an audience in that superstitious age, an audience spell-bound by the atmosphere of the supernatural, cunningly created by the great magician-dramatist, and thrilled to the utmost by the wonderful scene[2] between Hamlet and his father's spirit which had just finished, this cellarage business would appear not laughable but startling, shocking, almost insufferable. They could only draw one conclusion from it; Hamlet's intellect to react in this manner must be tottering on the verge of madness. It was the conclusion that Shakespeare intended them to draw; and the effect of the whole scene, characterized as it is by that blend of the comic and the infernal which appealed so strongly to the mediaeval mind, must have been extraordinarily powerful in a seventeenth century theatre.

Nothing we have said so far affects the main structure of Dr Greg's thesis. He is a careful writer, and has been at pains to provide himself with a loophole in regard to this question of the Ghost's objectivity. 'It would,' he says, 'in no way invalidate the thesis of this essay to admit that the dumb ghost of the murdered king did actually haunt the scenes of his early life.' Yet, to quote him again: 'if one wishes to discuss an author's treatment of any particular matter, one should take into consideration his general attitude towards the subject.' And if I have carried the reader with me up to the present point, he will be ready I think to agree that Dr Greg's 'general attitude' towards dramatic criticism is unsatisfactory, inasmuch as he tends to ignore the distinction between drama and history, forgets that the story he is concerned with was written for the stage, and commits the error of ridiculing scenes, which would have seemed perfectly natural to an early seventeenth century audience, although they appear irrational to a modern spectator or reader.

---

[1] The second Quarto is even more explicit on this point than our modern text. It gives 'Ghost cries under the Stage' as a stage-direction and makes the Ghost in one instance say 'Sweare by his sword.'

[2] *Pace* Dr Greg.

The hallucination-theory demands a 'dumb ghost.' Believe or disbelieve in the Ghost, as you will, you cannot believe in the Ghost's revelation to Hamlet, since the events of the play-scene give it the lie direct. Leaving the play-scene for later consideration, in order to preserve Shakespeare's sequence of events, let us consider this revelation. In so doing we shall discover at least two curious points which Dr Greg has strangely overlooked, and which make things very awkward for his argument. Personally, I feel that the impression of the Ghost's objective reality has been so firmly built up in the minds of the audience before it opens its mouth, that the average spectator is prepared to take on trust almost anything it chooses to say. Possibly, however, the critical faculty of the 'judicious' may still be awake. If so, what is there in the revelation-scene to create suspicion? First, Dr Greg tells us, there is the style of the Ghost's speech. 'Did the dubious influence of Seneca ever produce a more frigid piece of academic declamation? Is this the way Shakespeare writes when he is in earnest?' To this we reply that it is exceedingly dangerous to assume that Shakespeare shared the views of the modern literary man on questions of style. Is the speech of the Ghost more academic, rhetorical or Senecan than the Pyrrhus-cum-Priam speech, which so moved Hamlet in Act II, scene 2? Yet it is almost certain that Shakespeare agreed with Hamlet in admiring the latter[1]. And I fancy that had the author of *Troilus and Cressida* left us a treatise on dramatic style, it would have amazed his twentieth century critics. Secondly there is the glimpse of purgatory which the Ghost gives us. 'Is this how Shakespeare seeks to impress us with even the cruder terrors of the after-world?', asks Dr Greg, comparing it with the great speech of Claudio in *Measure for Measure.* The conception of the after-world is the same in both speeches, a point which might have given Dr Greg pause to consider the possibility of its being also Shakespeare's; the difference is in the expression of it. Claudio's words are swift, fiery, impetuous, anguished, as befits the utterance of a young full-blooded man faced with the prospect of sudden death. The Ghost's are frigid, slow, rhetorical if you will; and do not they also admirably suit the character that speaks them—a thing 'majestical,' a pallid ghost with neither blood nor pulse, and withal the spirit of a king? Whether Shakespeare succeeds or not dramatically in this ghost-scene is a question that each reader must decide for himself. Speaking for my own part, I must assert most emphatically that he does. I confess to being unable to read the scene, even now, familiar as it is, without a thrill of horror; the very frigidity of the Ghost, of which Dr Greg makes such fun, electrifies me. Perhaps this is because the memory of the scene *on the stage* still haunts me. For there can surely be no doubt that as a piece of stage-craft it is highly effective; it is in fact one of the great scenic triumphs of the play. Even Dr Greg admits something of this. 'There is indeed a curious horror in the scene, but it is the horror of a painted cloth, of a grotesque fresco...a thing we ridicule even while we shudder and our gorge rises at it.' Just so. *We*, or rather Dr Greg and those of his temperament, ridicule; but did Shakespeare's audience, including even the 'judicious' among them? Given the psychological atmosphere of the Elizabethan theatre; given the mediaeval conception of a ghost, a slow-moving, passionless, awe-inspiring, thing majestical; given the current views on what constituted 'the grand style,' views which Shakespeare almost undoubtedly shared with his contemporaries; given all this, and can we imagine any different scene and speech than Shakespeare's? Or indeed anything finer or more impressive[1]?

---

[1] See the note in Bradley's *Shakespearean Tragedy* on this point (p. 413).

But *de gustibus*...! Let us pass to the more profitable matter of the actual information which the Ghost conveys. 'The Ghost gives Hamlet one, and only one, piece of information he did not already possess'—the fact that the poison was administered through the ears of the victim. Thus Dr Greg. But is it so? Did Hamlet know, until the Ghost told him, that his father had been murdered? He began to suspect it when he heard that his 'father's spirit in arms' was walking the castle battlements; and the exclamation 'O my prophetic soul shows that the suspicion had grown in the waiting interval. But he could not and did not *know* before he had speech with the Ghost itself. Dr Greg, however, will no doubt explain this as surmise ripening by hallucination into certainty. Be it so. But what of another piece of information imparted by the Ghost, which Dr Greg passes over entirely[1]? The passage is not a pleasant one, but it has never been properly faced by critics, and must therefore be quoted in full.

---

[1] I am prepared to concede that parts of this scene appear to be written in a style earlier than that of the rest of the play.

> Ay, that incestuous, that *adulterate* beast,
> With witchcraft of his wit, with traitorous gifts,
> O wicked wit and gifts, that have the power
> So to *seduce!—won to his shameful lust*
> *The will of my most seeming-virtuous queen;*
> O Hamlet, what a falling off was there!
> From me, whose love was of that dignity
> That it went hand in hand *even with the vow*
> *I made to her in marriage;* and to decline
> Upon a wretch, whose natural gifts were poor
> To those of mine!
> But virtue, as it never will be moved,
> Though lewdness court it in the shape of heaven,
> *So lust, though to a radiant angel link'd,*
> *Will sate itself in a celestial bed,*
> *And prey on garbage.*

Is the Ghost speaking here of the o'er hasty marriage of Claudius and Gertrude? Assuredly not. His 'certain term' was drawing rapidly to an end, and he was already beginning to 'scent the morning air.' Hamlet knew of the marriage, and his whole soul was filled with nausea at the thought of the speedy hasting to 'incestuous sheets.' Why then should the Ghost waste his precious moments in telling Hamlet what he was fully cognisant of before? He had come from his 'prison-house' to incite Hamlet to revenge by bringing him *news*, news which only he could communicate to his son. Again, the passage occurs before the account of the murder, and therefore presumably deals with events preceding the crime in the orchard. Moreover, though the word 'incestuous' was applicable to the marriage, and had already been used by Hamlet in speaking of it before he heard of the Ghost, the rest of the passage is entirely inapplicable to it. Marriage, even if, like that of Claudius, contrary to the Church's law, cannot be described as 'adulterate.' Nor do the words 'witchcraft,' 'traitorous gifts,' 'seduce,' 'shameful lust,' and 'seeming-virtuous' seem at all suitable to Gertrude's second marriage, which, though may-be uncanonical, indecently swift, and to Hamlet, with his devotion for his father, shocking in the extreme, was not an uncommon act in royal households, or considered reprehensible by the worldly-minded. But the rest of the quotation (the first six lines of which are cited by Dr Greg as an illustration of the Ghost's comicality!) leave no doubt upon the matter. The comparison of the 'natural gifts' of King Hamlet with those of his brother, taken in conjunction with the reference to the 'marriage-vow,' 'celestial bed,' and 'preying on garbage,' can have but one meaning. *The Ghost is speaking of Gertrude's infidelity before his death*, an infidelity for which she had not the shadow of an excuse[1]. Can there be any question of this? The Ghost breathes not a hint of the Queen's possible complicity in the murder; on the contrary, his special charge to Hamlet concerning her makes it clear that he acquitted her of any knowledge of it. Consequently Hamlet's fierce cry 'O most pernicious woman!' uttered shortly after the Ghost's exit can refer to nothing else but the new fact he has just gleaned as to her unfaithfulness towards his father while he was alive. Again, the scene in Act III between mother and son is inexplicable unless Hamlet has something more against her than her hasty marriage. He does not accuse her of adultery in so many words, yet the speech beginning

---

[1] He glides over the word 'adulterate' with the single comment: 'rhetoric almost demands the second adjective.' Poor Shakespeare!

> Such an act
> That blurs the grace and blush of modesty,
> Calls virtue hypocrite, takes off the rose
> From the fair forehead of an innocent love,
> And sets a blister there, *makes marriage-vows*
> *As false as dicers' oaths*: O, such a deed
> *As from the body of contraction plucks*
> *The very soul*, and sweet religion makes
> A rhapsody of words,

is a clear enough indication of what he has in his mind, and is altogether extravagant if taken as referring only to her marriage. The Queen sees that he knows all, and, in her mood of facile repentance, implicitly admits her guilt.

---

[1] Professor Bradley (*Shakespearean Tragedy*, p. 166) accepts this reading without hesitation, as 'the most natural interpretation of the words of the Ghost.' The view also receives support from the contemporary *Hystorie of Hamblet*, which, in speaking of the murderer of Hamblet's father, declares 'that before he had any violent or bloody hands, or once committed parricide upon his brother, he had incestuously abused his wife.' The book is a translation of the Hamlet-story in Belleforest, which is usually assumed to have been the chief source of the play. Our earliest edition is dated 1608, and it is conjectured that the translator was influenced by Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. But whether Shakespeare borrowed the idea from the novelist or the novelist from Shakespeare, does not affect the point that the previous adultery of the Queen was recognised as an element of the story in Shakespeare's day. The employment of the word 'incestuously,' in the *Hystorie*, to describe adultery with a brother's wife, should be noted in reference to Shakespeare's use of the term in the passage quoted above. The Ghost, I am convinced, is intended to be speaking of the adultery throughout his speech, though his use of the word 'incestuous' is probably the reason why so few critics have understood the passage aright. Hamlet employs the word in the same sense at the end of the play, as he forces the poison down the King's throat, with 'Here, thou incestuous, murderous, damned Dane'—a complete history of Claudius in one line. Finally the first Quarto mentions the adultery two or three times.

What then is Dr Greg to make of all this? The information which the Ghost gives as to the method of the poisoning may be false, but the speech as a whole cannot possibly be 'a mere figment of Hamlet's brain,' since it communicates to Hamlet a fact, of which he shows previously not the least suspicion, and which is at the same time undoubtedly true.

And there is another point. The Ghost tells the spectators only one fact about the murder the truth of which they cannot test. Dr Greg makes much of this without seeing that it recoils upon his own interpretation of the play. We know that Claudius murdered his brother because he confesses it in the prayer-scene; we know that the deed was done by means of poison because it was given out that a serpent had stung the victim[1]; we know that the old king was murdered in his orchard or garden, during his after-dinner nap; we know finally that Claudius seized the crown and married the Queen. Now all these facts are mentioned not only in the speech of the Ghost, but also in the story of Gonzago. One of Dr Greg's principal arguments is the strange coincidence that the players should have in stock a play which was 'a minutely applicable representation of the affairs of the Danish Court, and of the alleged murder of the late king.' Once Dr Greg points the matter out to us, it certainly does seem remarkable. But let us suppose that the Ghost lies in the one particular in which we cannot bring his testimony to the proof; let us suppose that Claudius administered the poison, not through the ears, but through the mouth, or by injection of some kind. Is not the coincidence between the Gonzago-play and the verified facts still sufficiently close to merit Dr Greg's criticism that 'it makes impossible demands upon the credulity of the audience'? And yet how many spectators or even readers have noticed the coincidence? 'The strangeness of this coincidence has been hidden from the critics by the vague idea that Hamlet had considerably altered the play in order to make it suit his purpose.' Exactly so. But Shakespeare did the hiding; and what was *his* purpose in so doing? In a word, has not Dr Greg succeeded in proving a little too much? Is it not conceivable that the real explanation of the coincidence is not that Hamlet's overwrought brain played him a trick, but that Shakespeare's ingenuity has played a trick upon his audience? The question brings us up against the problem of the play-scene which we must now turn and consider. It is sufficient to notice here that once again the hallucination hypothesis has failed to account for all the facts of the dramatic situation.

---

[1] This is ghost-evidence, but Hamlet could not possibly have imagined a detail which had reached 'the whole ear of Denmark.'

Before proceeding to examine Dr Greg's interpretation of the play-scene and to deal with the puzzle of the dumb-show, it will be well to sum up the results so far obtained. We have seen: (1) that the information of the Ghost can be proved true in all details except one—the actual manner in which the poison was administered; (2) that the Ghost's speech cannot possibly be 'a mere figment of Hamlet's brain,' since it communicates to him a horrible, and on the evidence of the text hitherto entirely unsuspected, fact about his mother, which she implicitly admits when he taxes her with it later; (3) that the strange parallelism between the story told by the Ghost and the Gonzago-play is quite inadequately explained by Dr Greg's theory, seeing that the action of the play embraces, apart from the suspect method of administering the poison, practically all the known circumstances which attended the crime of Claudius. It is conceivable that his subconscious memory of the play might have suggested to Hamlet the details of the Ghost's speech, but it is not conceivable that the author of the play, whoever he may have been, should have borrowed his whole plot from the occurrences at Elsinore, and that *before they had taken place!*

Dr Greg's attack upon the Ghost is as futile as that of Marcellus. The majesty of buried Denmark remains invulnerable, and his honesty unimpeachable. Rest, rest, perturbed spirit!

II.

THE HARMLESS NECESSARY DUMB-SHOW.

Ophelia. Belike this show imports the argument of the play.

By this time, I trust, readers will begin to realise that 'something is rotten in the state of' the hallucination-theory, and that this 'something' is the assumption that underlies it, the assumption that the solution of a difficulty in the structure of a Shakespearean play may be arrived at along the same lines, and by the same methods, as are appropriate in dealing with a problem in history or bibliography. In other words, 'the mistake of criticising drama as history,' which as we have seen vitiates Dr Greg's secondary thesis—the collective-suggestion-spook theory—vitiates also in a large measure his main thesis, which, if not yet in ruins, is at least visibly cracking. This historical fallacy is, moreover, responsible, in part at any rate, for his interpretation of the play-scene, which we have now to examine. But here we shall have occasion more often to refer to another critical canon which he has laid down for our guidance. 'We are bound,' he writes, 'to explain the action of characters through analysis of the text; we are not at liberty to invent motives in the abstract.' Add to 'motives' the words 'actions, moods, changes of purpose, and trains of thought, and the doctrine is unexceptionable. Interpretation of action or character in Shakespeare's plays, if it is to be really sound, must be based upon the text, *the whole text*, and nothing but the text. It was through neglecting to take into account the whole text that Dr Greg went wrong in his reading of the Ghost's speech. It is for precisely the same reason that his interpretation of the interplay of character in the play-scene, brilliant, eloquent and seductive as it is, when taken by itself, becomes entirely unconvincing directly we lay it side by side with the text of Shakespeare.

If the hallucination-theory be true, we have to find some reason, other than the prick of conscience, for Claudius's behaviour in the play-scene. Why, if his withers were unwrung by what he saw upon the court-stage, did he rise and break off the play so suddenly? 'It must be remembered,' writes Dr Greg with his usual caution, 'that I am not seeking to prove a theory from my interpretation of the scene; I merely wish to show that the scene can be logically interpreted upon a theory, which other considerations have forced upon us.' In spite of this disclaimer, he was as a matter of fact compelled to face the problem; for, without some satisfactory explanation of what happened in the play-scene, and in particular of Claudius's 'marvellous distemperature,' his main theory could not be regarded as conclusive. The interpretation he suggests is, in outline, as follows. As the notabilities gather on the stage to watch the play, Hamlet 'begins to grow excited, and, as always, tries to hide the turmoil of his mind behind a mask of strange behaviour.' This excitement was probably increased by the appearance of the dumb-show, which divulged his plot prematurely and can hardly have been expected by him. It was certainly greatly augmented by the extraordinary indifference of Claudius to this pantomimic representation of his crime in all its details. 'Is the trap going to prove a failure after all?', he asks himself. Under the stress of this gnawing doubt and of his growing excitement, 'his brain whirls and strikes sparks from any thought that crosses it.' Hence his insulting remarks to Ophelia. And 'gradually, subconsciously' as the play progresses, and his excitement increases, there occurs *a change in his intention.*

The dumb-show having missed fire, he has small hopes of the play itself; but he cannot allow the opportunity to slip past without finding out the truth. 'If he can only break down the King's defences, if he can only frighten him sufficiently, he *must* give himself away by some manifest and public act.' And by the time the Player King is ready for his sleep, Hamlet's 'original purpose is long forgotten. In his excitement he lashes out all round: he insults Ophelia, outrages the Queen, gibes at the King, and taunts him before the assembled court. In fine he behaves like a madman; there is no telling what he will do next.' Lucianus appears with the phial in his hands, and speaks his six lines. 'It would be difficult to imagine more stilted commonplace, a speech less calculated to unnerve a guilty spectator. But for Hamlet the supreme moment, so long anxiously expected, has arrived. The murderer empties his poison into the sleeper's ears, and—the King rises? Not a bit of it. Hamlet is unable to restrain himself any longer; he breaks out, hurling the crude facts of the story in the King's face, shouting, gesticulating, past reason and control. It seems as though the next moment he must spring at his throat. Naturally the court breaks up, the King himself rises, calls for lights, and retires to his private apartments, convinced—not that his guilt has been discovered, but that Hamlet is a dangerous madman, who has designs on his life, and must, at all costs, be got quietly out of the country, and, if possible, out of the world. It is true that his conscience is touched, and that in the next scene we see its final wriggles; but, though he knows the danger he runs from Hamlet's hatred, and though he justly fears the doom of heaven, he gives, throughout his soliloquy, no indication that his secret has been discovered, he shows no anxiety as to the judgment of his fellow-men.'

There are, as will be noticed, six distinct assumptions in the foregoing reading of the play-scene. (i) Hamlet is in a state of excitement when the scene opens. (ii) This excitement grows more and more violent as the scene proceeds. (iii) The unlooked-for dumb-show, and its failure to stir the King's conscience, cause Hamlet to change his intention, and to force Claudius to self-exposure by frightening him, instead of leaving the play to do the work[1]. (iv) The King does *not* rise at the poisoning. (v) Hamlet, thereupon, becomes unbearably violent, and the court disperses in confusion. (vi) In the prayer-scene the King gives no hint of recent exposure. He does not know that Hamlet knows.

---

[1] I trust I am interpreting Dr Greg correctly in regard to this 'change of intention.' I must confess that when I began to analyse his treatment of the scene I found the point difficult to follow. He appears at one moment to assume that Hamlet still has hopes of the play ('He...sets himself to ensure that the play itself shall not fail as the dumb-show failed'), a little later on that he has forgotten all about it ('Hamlet's only chance is actually to frighten him into self-betrayal. His original purpose is long forgotten'), and yet later that the play is all-in-all to him ('For Hamlet the supreme moment, so long anxiously expected, has arrived').

It is an exceedingly pretty piece of critical exposition. The only flaw in it is that not a single one of the six pillars which support it has any real basis in the text of Shakespeare. Let us take them one by one and see.

(i) On Dr Greg's own showing, Hamlet during his talks with the First Player, and with Horatio earlier in the scene, 'has been his own self, calm and collected.' Does his mood change as the play-scene opens? Shakespeare, whom we have seen to be sometimes a careless historian, is in general as a dramatist a painstaking fellow enough; he has a habit, for example, of giving clues to the moods of his principal characters just before or just after an important scene begins. In the present instance the clue is a very obvious one. Hamlet, seeing the court procession about to enter, breaks off his talk with Horatio, with these words: 'They are coming to the play; *I must be idle*: Get you a place.' The meaning is unmistakable. The two have just been plotting to watch the King together; he must not see them in collusion; 'get you a place' says Hamlet in a hurried whisper. Hamlet, too, has a part to play in this drama. 'I must be idle,' that is to say 'crazy[1].' Horatio is not to be surprised if he does some mad things in the coming scene, since he is *deliberately* assuming his 'antic disposition,' in order to put the King off the scent, and to further his own scheme. There is no excitement here; it is all strikingly cool-headed and calculated. And the conversation before the entrance of the dumb-show is exactly what one would expect from his words to Horatio; it is all 'idle,' and, though it is full of double meaning, there is not a trace of excitement in it.

(ii) We may agree that Hamlet was upset at the appearance of the dumb-show, and that 'miching mallecho; it means mischief' is an indication that it was unexpected. But what evidence is there for the growing mental excitement which Dr Greg posits? There is a brief conversation with Ophelia about the Prologue, intermingled with a little ribaldry, at one point perhaps unnecessarily strong—a conversation, which as the *real* audience knows, partly reflects upon the Queen. Then follow seventy lines of the Gonzago-play, during which Hamlet makes two remarks, which are sardonic but certainly not excited. The Player King sleeps and Hamlet turns with 'Madam, how like you this play?' A slap in the face before the whole court! exclaims Dr Greg. The remark is certainly pointed enough; but the Queen appears quite unmoved, for her answer is bland: 'The lady doth protest too much, methinks.' It is aesthetic criticism. The words would have been impossible had she really understood, as the audience chucklingly appreciates. But the King is not so thick-skinned, though Hamlet partially soothes him with his talk of Vienna, Gonzago and Baptista, only partially however, for he would not have him go to sleep. Hamlet's whole behaviour except for one brief lapse is masterly in its self-control up to the entrance of the Poisoner.

---

[1] There is ample contemporary evidence for this interpretation of 'idle.' See N.E.D. *idle* and *idle-headed*.

(iii) As there is no evidence for Hamlet's 'excitement' so there is none for that 'change of intention' of which Dr Greg makes so much. Such a change in the mind of Hamlet, if it actually took place, would be one of the turning-points of the play, and it is inconceivable that Shakespeare should not have inserted some clue to it, obvious to the 'judicious' but perhaps passing unnoticed by the attention of the 'generality' as part of Hamlet's 'antic disposition.' And without Shakespeare's help, the actor can do nothing. Even a cinema artist would be hard put to it to play Hamlet *à la* Dr Greg; for the change takes place presumably during the seventy lines of the Gonzago-play, while Hamlet has nothing to say and the audience is engaged in looking, not at him, but at the Player King and Queen. In short, Dr Greg has torn out Shakespeare's pages and inserted a chapter from a psychological novel of his own invention.

(iv) We now reach the crucial point of Dr Greg's interpretation of the scene. He has to show that it is Hamlet's conduct and not the poisoning which causes Claudius to rise, and he bends all his ingenuity to the task. 'The murderer empties his poison into the sleeper's ears, and—the King rises? Not a bit of it.' And the statement is expanded in a footnote: 'This is really the only legitimate interpretation of the text. Hamlet has time for a speech of four lines before Ophelia says: "The King rises." Note too that Hamlet's words, "you shall see anon," assume that the play is going forward.' Alas, we are down to the bone here. Four lines! Four little lines; it is a thin covering for Dr Greg's theory against the searching winds of common-sense. Four lines! Think of those 'judicious' spectators; what lightning intelligences they must possess to catch the point! And suppose the orthodox interpretation is right; suppose that Claudius does not begin to see the significance of the whole business until the Poisoner's speech commences and that the parallel only dawns upon him in all its horror when the actor bends to pour the 'mixture rank' into the ears of the victim, will he rise *at once*? Will he not rather sit dazed and ashen white for a moment on his chair of state—a moment quite long enough for Hamlet to say his four lines—and then totter from the room? Had Dr Greg but looked twenty-five lines farther on, as he wrote, he would have seen that this, and not *his* reading, is 'the only legitimate interpretation of the text.'

> *Hamlet.* O good Horatio, I'll take the Ghost's word for a thousand pound. Didst perceive?
> *Horatio.* Very well, my lord.
> *Hamlet.* *Upon the talk of the poisoning?*
> *Horatio.* I did very well note him.

Hamlet and Horatio had agreed before the play-scene to 'rivet' their eyes upon the face of Claudius, and they are comparing notes. When had 'his occulted guilt' first unkennelled itself? When the murderer poured the poison into the sleeper's ears? Not a bit of it! It was upon the *talk* of the poisoning. In other words, the King betrayed himself in the eyes of both Hamlet and Horatio (I trust Dr Greg will allow Horatio to be considered a credible witness on this point) *before he had actually seen the manner in which the poison was to be administered.* Even had the Ghost been wrong in the one statement which we cannot bring to the test of external evidence, it would have made no difference. The poisoning, no doubt, finishes off the job, and sends the King, shambling, groping and stammering for light, out of the room; but words not deeds first banish the blood from his cheeks. Thus by neglecting to reckon with the whole text, Dr Greg has allowed us to break through the hallucination-theory on his main front. It was not that he had not noticed the deadly passage; he quotes it readily enough in dealing with the problem of the dumb-show. What he fails to observe is that, while it makes the dumb-show business puzzling, it makes his own reading of the scene impossible.

(v) And if Hamlet, with his eyes upon Claudius, has seen him blench at the talk of the poisoning, why should he break out, 'hurling the crude facts of the story in the King's face, shouting, gesticulating, past reason and control'? Will not his mood be one of exultancy and elation, the mood which 'breaks out' in ballad-snatches and doggerel, directly he has Horatio to himself? There is not the smallest symptom of anger, hatred or madness in this later conversation. He is triumphant, jocular—a jocularity which Horatio shares; it is the happiest moment in his career, for he has succeeded! But those 'four lines[1].' Well, look at them!

> He poisons him i' the garden for 's estate, his name 's Gonzago, the story is extant, and written in very choice Italian, you shall see anon how the murderer gets the love of Gonzago's wife.

Hamlet sees the hunted look of Claudius, sees that the speech-poison has penetrated his ears, and that the King can stand no more. But he will keep up his own part to the last, the part of 'chorus,' and his final words on the play are in strict accordance with all that he has said to the King hitherto. They are a variation on the theme: 'Your majesty and we that have free souls, it touches us not.' Not the slightest trace of shouting, gesticulating, or lack of self-control: only a sly assurance that there is 'no offence i' the world,' bland assumption that the King will of course see the play out to the end, with perhaps just a mild touch of surprise at his extraordinary conduct, which is now becoming visible to the whole court—and underneath all this the wildest and most malicious glee possible!

(vi) In the concluding sentence of his interpretation of the play-scene Dr Greg makes an important admission in regard to Claudius. 'It is true,' he writes, 'that his conscience is touched, and that in the next scene we see its final wriggles.' So, after all these pages of exposition and all this clever juggling with the plain meaning of the text, we have the concession that the play has caught the conscience of the King and that there *is* something in the orthodox theory. What has compelled Dr Greg to make this strange and unexpected admission? It is the fact that the prayer-scene stares him in the face, a scene which can only be explained on one theory, the theory that Claudius has recently been 'tented to the quick' about his brother's murder. And what has brought him to his knees? Hamlet's conduct, as interpreted by Dr Greg? On the contrary, Hamlet inspired him with deadly hatred and he was already plotting to murder the son as he had murdered the father. No, there is nothing for it. The prayer-scene is the direct consequence of the talk of poisoning and its representation before his eyes. It is an awkward point for Dr Greg, and he wisely glides quickly over it. Yet he makes a valiant attempt to pluck victory out of the jaws of defeat, by insisting that Claudius gives no hint throughout his soliloquy that his secret has been discovered. That he should not do so, would be no point against the orthodox theory. Even Claudius, we might suppose, would hesitate to admit to his Maker that repentance had been forced upon him by discovery. But as a matter of fact Shakespeare does not shrink from imputing to him this last touch of contemptibility. The prayer opens as follows:

---

[1] 'Four' is an exaggeration on Dr Greg's part. The compositor of Q_2 gets the speech into two and three quarter lines. It is noticeable also that the passage contains four commas (i.e. pauses)—suggestive of deliberation in the utterance, not excitement.

> O, my offence is rank, it smells to heaven,
> It hath the primal eldest curse upon 't,
> A brother's murder.

He is in short a Cain, suffering under the 'primal eldest curse,' exposure in the eyes of man. The Gonzago-play, to use a common and expressive piece of Elizabethan English, has 'put the brand upon him[1].'

We have seen that Dr Greg's reading of the play-scene is entirely unsupported by the evidence of the text, that Claudius does recognise his crime in the speech of the murderer and that, therefore, the veracity of the Ghost has received its crowning proof. What then remains of the beautiful hallucination-edifice so cunningly reared by Dr Greg? Nothing at all, except these two strange features of *Hamlet* upon which he rears his whole hypothesis: the parallel plots and the puzzle of the dumb-show. In order to round off the subject it is necessary to provide an explanation of these anomalies which is dramatically a satisfactory one. The problem, we shall discover, is a single one; for the anomalies are only two aspects of the same phenomenon. The solution also is simple enough, though unfortunately to expound it properly would demand more than the page or two, which is all that can be allowed here. The reader is, therefore, asked to regard what follows as merely the outline of a lengthy argument.

The references to the Gonzago-play before the play-scene are strikingly meagre. It is worth while to run over them briefly. The idea of having a play was a sudden inspiration on Hamlet's part. He knows nothing of the advent of the players at court until Rosencrantz informs him in Act III, scene 2, and they enter shortly after in the course of the same scene. The First Player, at Hamlet's invitation, then recites the Pyrrhus-cum-Priam speech; and it is during this recitation that the Gonzago scheme takes root in Hamlet's brain, for as the rest of the actors go out with Polonius, the Prince stops the First Player, asks him if he can play *The Murder of Gonzago*, tells him to have it ready by 'to-morrow night,' and bids him 'study a speech of some dozen or sixteen lines' which he will in the meantime 'set down and insert in't.' The working of Hamlet's mind during all this is made clear from the 'rogue and peasant slave' soliloquy which follows. What could not this actor effect, he asks,

---

[1] I give the punctuation of the passage as it appears in Q_2. Shakespeare clearly intended 'a brother's murder' to be taken in apposition to 'my offence.' The modern punctuation obscures this.

> Had he the motive and the cue for passion
> That I have? He would drown the stage in tears,
> And cleave the general ear with horrid speech,
> Make mad the guilty and appal the free.

And later we have Hamlet's intention revealed, in the words:

> I'll have these players
> Play something like the murder of my father
> Before mine uncle: I'll observe his looks;
> I'll tent him to the quick: if he but blench,
> I know my course.

In the following scene the King and Queen hear of the projected play and promise to attend. At the opening of the scene that comes next, we find the stage all ready prepared for the play, and Hamlet giving the First Player his final directions as to how his inserted speech should be spoken. The players then go out to dress for the performance, and Hamlet has his conversation with Horatio. In the course of this he informs him that

> There is a play to-night before the king;
> One scene of it comes near the circumstance
> Which I have told you of my father's death,

and bids him, when he 'sees that act a-foot,'

> Observe my uncle: if his occulted guilt
> Do not itself unkennel in one speech,
> It is a damned ghost that we have seen.

Immediately after this the play-scene itself begins.

These being the only references to the Gonzago-story, before the play-scene opens, the audience in the theatre knows nothing of its contents except that it is called *The Murder of Gonzago,* that it is 'something like the murder' of the late King, and that Hamlet has inserted a short speech in it, which will presumably make the likeness still clearer. Surely what we are here confronted with is an extraordinarily ingenious piece of stage-craft! For consider Shakespeare's problem. The idea of having a play within the play is a famous one, we can imagine him saying to himself, but it is attended with certain difficulties. To serve its dramatic purpose, the actors' play must come as close as possible to the situation at the Danish court; for not only has Hamlet to catch the King's conscience but I have to catch and rivet the attention of my audience. '*Something* like' will not do at all; it must be identical, or, at least differing only in such a way as will indicate that it is another story, without impairing the overwhelming dramatic effect of its similarity upon the mind of Claudius and of the spectators in the theatre. The play, then, must have an Italian, not a Danish, atmosphere; and reference to the Queen's previous infidelity shall be omitted, as indeed is only fitting in view of the Ghost's careful injunction to Hamlet to spare his mother from open exposure. But if these differences are small, as they must be, if the scene is to be really effective, will not the audience be asking themselves how it comes about that the actors should have a play, the plot of which is to all intents identical with what had taken place at Elsinore? To avoid such questions it will be necessary to throw them off the scent. They shall be told that the Gonzago-story is 'something like the murder' of the late King, that 'one scene of it comes near the circumstance' of the actual poisoning, that Hamlet has to adapt it for his purposes; but they shall know nothing more about the matter until they see the play itself. Thus they will be prepared for similarity, part of which they will assume to be due to Hamlet's adaptation, while in the excitement of the play-scene itself, when the almost complete identity breaks upon them for the first time, their minds will be too busy with other things to be enquiring where the actors got the play from[1].

Further, if for the reasons just given it was impossible for Shakespeare to divulge the plot of the Gonzago-story before the play-scene was reached, it was equally impossible for him to set out the plot in full in the Gonzago-play itself. The play is a Mouse-trap, the jaws of which must snap upon the imprisoned Claudius, suddenly, unexpectedly, overwhelmingly. The King must be taken by complete surprise or Hamlet's purpose will be frustrated. Accordingly we have seventy lines of dialogue, between a king and queen, on the subject of widowhood and second marriage, then a sudden murder by a person of whose name and motive we should know nothing did not Hamlet enlighten us,—and that is all! It is not a play; it is not even a scene; it is a piece of a scene, terminated by Claudius at the very moment when the only action which occurs in it is taking place. Thus neither before nor during the play can Shakespeare tell his audience what the plot of the whole business is. And yet somehow he must take them into his confidence, or they will not realise what is going to happen and so will miss the pleasure of watching, with Hamlet, the unconscious criminal drawing nearer and nearer to the trap. Their memories too need refreshing, for by this time the details of the crime will have been partly forgotten. Moreover, if the parallelism between the Gonzago-story and the speech of the Ghost is not made absolutely clear, the whole dramatic effect of the play-scene will be ruined. It was a pretty dilemma; how was Shakespeare to get out of it? Stage-craft afforded him the only possible means of escape. *He must put the whole plot into a dumb-show.* 'Belike this show,' says Ophelia, who gives us the clue not for the last time in this scene, 'imports the *argument* of the play.' It does; and so successful is the trick, that we do not notice anything wrong about the play while it is being acted.

---

[1] But where did Shakespeare get the play from? Possibly he may have constructed the Gonzago-plot to fit the facts of the situation at Elsinore. There is, however, strong evidence that the boot is on the other leg. In the *Historie of Hamblet*, the 1608 translation from Belleforest's *Histoires Tragiques*, which is generally recognised as the source of the play, there is no mention either of poison, sleep or orchard. On the contrary it is expressly stated that the deed was done by bloody violence in the banqueting-hall of the palace, while the King sat at meat. On the other hand *The Murder of Gonzago* bears all the indications of being founded upon an Italian original; and I see no reason for doubting that Hamlet's remark, 'The story is extant, and written in very choice Italian,' was substantially correct. Indeed there are even indications of an historical foundation for the story, since according to Dowden, as quoted by Dr Greg, 'In 1538 the Duke of Urbino, married to a Gonzaga, was murdered by Luigi Gonzaga, who dropped poison into his ear.' What more likely than that Shakespeare, or the author of the *ur-Hamlet*, used a scene from a contemporary play upon this subject for his play-scene, and, in order to make the resemblance closer, altered the Hamlet-story to suit the story of Gonzago? 'In other words,' as Dr Greg truly remarks, 'it was not the Ghost's story that suggested the *Murder of Gonzago*, but the *Murder of Gonzago* that supplied the details of the Ghost's story.' The only point on which we differ from Dr Greg here is that the suggestion in question reached the Ghost not *via* Hamlet's brain, but *via* Shakespeare's! And this being so, side by side with Saxo Grammaticus we must place the unknown Italian author of the tale or play, *The Murder of Gonzago*, as joint provider of the source of *Hamlet*.

But what about Claudius? If he is to be lured unsuspectingly into the trap, how can he face the detailed parallelism of the dumb-show? Here we stumble upon the dramatic pebble which Dr Greg has made the head-stone of his corner. But Shakespeare saw it three hundred years and more before Dr Greg, and he avoided it by yet another simple stage-trick. *He had to make it quite apparent to his audience that Claudius was not looking at the dumb-show.* There is nothing new in this explanation. It was first suggested by Halliwell, and has since found its way into all the text-books. Dr Greg calls it 'tame,' but it is only tame, in so far as the critics have put it forward timidly, have not seen that it can be proved from the text, and have failed to observe how cleverly Shakespeare managed the business. It should be as apparent to the modern reader as it undoubtedly was to the Elizabethan spectator that Claudius did not see the dumb-show, because he himself tells us so in unmistakable terms. The Player King and Queen speak their seventy lines, and during the pause before the murderer appears, Claudius turns to Hamlet with these words: 'Have you heard the *argument*? Is there no offence in't?' It is a question which would have been quite impossible if Claudius had seen the dumb-show, the dumb-show which *is* the 'argument of the play' as Shakespeare has carefully informed us through the mouth of Ophelia.

Halliwell's theory is that Claudius did not see the dumb-show because he was talking to the Queen at the time. But Halliwell does not attempt to support this from the text and omits to show how Shakespeare made the whole thing quite clear to his audience—a vital point. Yet the business is patent enough. When Claudius and Polonius come to the play their minds are full of what they have recently overheard Hamlet say to Ophelia in the Nunnery scene which immediately precedes the play. Hamlet's references to his 'proud, revengeful, ambitious' nature and the threat in his assertion that 'those that are married already, *all but one*, shall live' have convinced Claudius, not that his nephew knows his secret (of that he has no suspicion until the play-scene draws to an end), but that Hamlet, the dispossessed heir, has designs upon the crown[1]. Polonius, on the other hand, is equally convinced by the general tenor of Hamlet's remarks to Ophelia that 'the origin and commencement of his grief sprung from neglected love.' Before the dumb-show comes on Hamlet plays up to both these explanations of his antic disposition. He supports the King's theory by his 'promise-crammed' reference, which is clearly a hint at his starved ambition and the King's promise of the succession in Act I, scene 2, and by his reminding Polonius of the scene upon the Capitol. On the other hand, he supports the theory of Polonius himself by ostentatiously refusing to sit by his mother and by taking a place at Ophelia's feet. 'O ho! do you mark that?' exclaims the old man exultantly to the King, thereby revealing what the two had been discussing in the interval between their eavesdropping and their appearance at the play. It is a discussion which Hamlet's action now revives in full force, and his ribaldry with Ophelia, clear indication of love-madness, supplies Polonius with still further argument. But there is yet a third explanation of the Prince's madness, the theory of Gertrude,—'his father's death and our o'er-hasty marriage'; and it amuses Hamlet to give this an innings also. 'Look you,' he says, 'how cheerfully my mother looks, and my father died within these two hours,' and he continues fiddling on the same string until the dumb-show appears. This sally complicates the matter between Claudius and

---

[1] This is not a view generally accepted by critics, but it would take too long to prove it here and its validity does not seriously affect the present argument.

Polonius and drags the Queen in also. It arrests too the attention of Shakespeare's audience, who at Hamlet's 'Look you' turn their full gaze upon the royal group to see how they take this attack. Thus they are fully aware of Claudius's preoccupation at this critical point; they observe the three figures with their heads together, closely engaged in whispered and exciting controversy, controversy which becomes half-audible directly Hamlet ceases speaking. The dumb-show enters and performs its pantomime, quite unnoticed by the three disputants, and the audience *know* that it is so. Doubtless, the dumb-show over, they turn to make sure that Claudius has not seen this striking representation of his crime. If so their anxiety is set at rest by finding him still at it, gesticulating angrily in his efforts to enlighten the darkness of his obstinate interlocutors. Hamlet, of course, is as anxious as the audience, and, though he too notices that the king sees nothing, his 'miching mallecho, it means mischief' expresses his annoyance, while 'the players cannot keep counsel, they'll tell all' is a clear indication of his jumpiness and his fears for what the bunglers on the inner stage may do next.

We cannot of course be certain how Shakespeare arranged this scene in his own theatre, but I am convinced that the foregoing comes close to his intentions. Halliwell's theory was 'tame' but it contained the root of the matter.

The traditional interpretation of *Hamlet* has been vindicated but we have seen that it carries with it implications not previously noticed. The value of Dr Greg's thesis is first that, by drawing attention to logical inconsistencies in the play, he has forced us to re-explore its ground-plan and so to catch the master-dramatist in his workshop, and secondly that, by attempting to adapt the play-scene to his theory, he has led us to examine the scene in a new light and so to find more in it than has hitherto been observed. The hallucination-theory would make Shakespeare out to be a far more sophisticated person than we had taken him for; its disproof has shown him to be a subtler dramatist and stage-craftsman than we knew. And the distinction between the two audiences, which Dr Greg makes, still holds good; the only difference being that, whereas he would draw the line between the credulous and the sceptical, we draw it where Hamlet did himself, i.e. between the 'generality' who flocked to the theatre to see a tragedy of revenge and cared for nothing but the story, and the 'judicious' who were interested in the niceties of drama, Shakespeare's fellow-dramatists and cultured patrons, who would catch points in the play which the ordinary spectator would miss, and which indeed have also been missed by the generality of modern critics. In particular the marvellous ingenuity of the play-scene as a whole has been totally obscured since the day when the dramatist himself stage-managed his own performances, an obscurity which we can see beginning as far back as the First Folio. But that is another story.

J. DOVER WILSON.

LEEDS.

OUR TRADITIONAL PROSODY AND AN ALTERNATIVE.

Touch. This is the very false gallop of verses:
  why do you infect yourself with them?
Ros. Peace, you dull fool, I found them on a tree.
Touch. Truly, the tree yields bad fruit.
As You Like It.

BLANK VERSE.

THE object of this paper is to show that English blank verse is written to a metrical scheme which proceeds on a trochaic base (– ⏑), and that our accepted prosody, which assumes an iambic base (⏑ –), is not only grounded on radical misconceptions of the whole matter, but also continually breaks down when tested by the work of the poets. From occasional references in works on English prosody I gather that the trochaic base is not now proposed for the first time, but I have not been able to discover any book or magazine article in which it is advocated[1].

Let me say at the outset that I recognise stress rather than quantity as the dominating factor in our prosody, since verse, with rare exceptions, observes the rules of ordinary pronunciation. On the other hand, most of our stressed syllables are actually long, and a quantitative notation has hitherto been usually and not unnaturally employed in works on English prosody. For these reasons, and because it will be more convenient for setting forth both the accepted system and that now offered, I shall use this notation, although it is so largely conventional. Thus a short *i*, as in *pity*, will, if stressed, be treated as a long syllable. Long syllables, when they take no stress and count as shorts, as *capp'd* in *cloud-capp'd towers*, will be described as 'irrational longs,' or briefly as 'irrationals,' and indicated by the symbol >. Other symbols used are ⏑ to denote a short syllable (♪); – to denote a long (theoretically twice the length of ⏑, as ♩ = ♫); └ to denote a long protracted to the length of three shorts, and ∧ to mark a pause of the length of ⏑. The recognised term 'foot' will be used to describe a metrical unit. The numbering of lines quoted from Shakespeare is that of the Globe edition.

---

[1] Since writing this paper, I have been informed that some German prosodists now scan German verse on a trochaic base.

According to the persistent tradition, originally founded, as I believe, on a confusion of metre with rhythm, the norm of the heroic line consists of a succession of five feet, each of which is an iambus (⏑ –́); a long syllable may, however, replace any short, making the foot into what is termed, but improperly, a spondee, – –́. Thus the normal scheme given is

⏒ –́ | ⏒ –́ | ⏒ –́ | ⏒ –́ | ⏒ –́ ||.

This scheme probably obtained acceptance because the Greek iambic line used to be so scanned, but for more than forty years now that scheme has been abandoned. It was found that Greek prosody as a whole must remain as incoherent and unintelligible as it had always been from post-classical times, unless the foot in all measures began with the stressed or chiefly stressed syllable. Accordingly for metrical purposes Greek scholars now divide the line thus,

⏑ ⋮ – ⏑ | – ⏑ | – ⏑ | – ⏑ | – ⏑ | – ∧ ||.

The six feet are counted from the first long, and the last foot is not completed. The initial syllable, of which more will be said below, is only introductory to the measure. As a metrical foot, therefore, ⏑ – no longer receives any support from Greek prosody, and its claims to be so employed must be considered solely on their own merits.

It is true that much of our verse can be made to conform to the traditional scheme—all lines, for instance, like

To sleep; perchance to dream: ay there's the rub;

but from Chaucer onwards we find a large number of lines, considerably more than half the heroic verse written, that are incapable of being fitted to a measure composed of such feet. The following are examples, scanned as by these or those of the prosodists:

(*a*) Háve I | nót in | a pítch'd | báttle | heárd. *T. S.* 1. 2. 206.
(*b*) ∧ Knéel | thou dówn | Phílip, | but ríse | more greát. *K. J.* 1. 1. 161.
(*c*) What a háste | loóks through | his éyes! | Só should | he loók. *Mac.* 1. 2. 46.
(*d*) Ánd his | gash'd stábs | loók'd like | a breách | in ná||ture. *Mac.* 2. 3. 112.
(*e*) That mý | keen knífe | seé not | the woúnd | it mákes. *Mac.* 1. 5. 53.
(*f*) The cú|riósi|ty of ná|tions tó | depríve || me. *Lear*, 1. 2. 4.
(*g*) ∧ Whát | may yoú | be? Áre | you of goód | or é||vil? *O.* 5. 1. 65.
(*h*) To the lást | árti|cle: my lórd | shall név|er rést. *O.* 3. 3. 22.
(*j*) ∧ Sét | at líber|ty: the fát | ríbs of | peáce. *K. J.* 3. 3. 9.
(*k*) Lét him | go, Gér|trude; dó | not féar | our pér||son. *Ham.* 4. 5. 122.
(*l*) Hére is | himsélf, | márr'd, as | you seé, | with traí||tors. *J. C.* 3. 2. 201.
(*m*) ∧ Thén | the whí|ning schoól-|boy wíth | his sátch||el. *A. Y. L.* 2. 7. 144.
(*n*) O mónst|rous áct! | —Víllan|y! víll|any! víll||any! *O.* 5. 2. 190.

(*o*) Márry | and amén, | how sound is she asleep! *R. J.* 4. 5. 8.
(*p*) ∧ Sáve | what béats | there. Fíli|al ingrát|itúde. *Lear*, 3. 4. 14.
(*q*) The bód|y's déli|cate: the témp|est ín | my mínd. *Lear*, 3. 4. 12.
(*r*) Twéaks me | by the nóse? | gíves me | the líe | i' the thróat? *Ham.* 2. 2. 601.
(*s*) "Fíer|y"! whát, | "quáli|ty"! Why, Gloú|cester, Gloú||cester. *Lear*, 2. 4. 97.
(*t*) Stéw'd in|corrúp|tion, hóney|ing and má|king lóve. *Ham.* 3. 4. 93.

One would have thought that anyone seeking to accommodate English verse to an iambic base would have abandoned the enterprise when faced by such an array of refractory lines as these typify; but as the scansions show, rather than be beaten, some ingenious person invented an astounding device called 'reversed stress' or 'inversion,' by which some of the feet are given a stress –́ ⏑ exactly the opposite of ⏑ –́ The enormity perpetrated in this stroke of genius is so glaring, the trick so absurd and childish, that one wonders how it ever came to be countenanced by anyone but its desperate author. It violates two fundamental principles of poetic measure, which are in fact adhered to in the iambic norm as given above, and are therefore tacitly admitted by its adoption. These are (*a*) that a measure must be compounded of units of *equivalent value*, and (*b*) that its rhythm or movement must be *continuous*. At the same time this device obliterates the essential distinction between the rhythm of verse and that of prose. In the former, if we are to have 'measure,' the stresses must occur at regular intervals, in the latter they must not do so to any considerable extent; and if a prosodist offers us as measure such a sequence of feet as ⏑ – | – ⏑ | ⏑ – | – ⏑ | ⏑ –, he is putting us off with the rhythm of prose. It is as little permissible, save as an exception, to invert the stress in verse as it is in music. Such exceptions do indeed occur occasionally both in music and in verse, but when the inversions are so frequent as to be normal, the verse equally with the music becomes a 'rag-time.'

Before discussing this scansion further it will be convenient to notice the view of some scholars of learning and distinction who, since they refuse to admit any but disyllabic feet in Shakespeare's verse, save under absolute compulsion, may without offence be called disyllabists. They of course postulate inversion. Starting from the unproved assumption that his constant aim was to write lines without resolved feet, they tell us he pronounced as follows in the lines quoted above: 'cu|rios't|y of na|tions—Villan|y, vill'|ny, vill'||ny—th'nose...th'throat—The bod|y's del'|cate: th'tem|pest—qual'ty—hon'ying.' The following further specimens of the method are a few out of many hundreds mostly taken from Goswin Koenig's *Der Vers in Shaksperes Dramen*, the accepted authority on the point at the present time: 'pill'ry, mag'cal, pen'ry, Hel'na, partic'lar, ridic'lous, des'late, perspic-yous, It'ly, wom'nish, Jess'ca, pit'ful, sorr'wful, Im'gen, prod'gal, conf'dent, app'tite, Jup'ter, vi'lent, ignom'ny or ignomy, duch'ss, do'ng, the'tre, dite (diet), quitely (quietly), de'ty, Prime (Priam), Plantajnet, th'breach, whi'r (whither), nour'sher, how came w'ashore?' It will be noticed that some of the combinations of consonants are not to be achieved without a splutter, and sometimes the aspirated *h* must be dropped, as in

Fier|y? th'fi'|ry duke? | Tell th'hot (th'ot)|duke that—.

The pronunciation of proper names varied in successive lines, as in ''Tis death for any one in Mantua To come to Pad'a' (Pajja?), and 'If Alcibi'des kill my countrymen, Let Alcibiades know this of Timon.' And being no humourist or even a punster, Shakespeare could make that 'most del'cate fiend' the Queen in *Cymbeline* say (for *evil-eyed*) *eel-eyed unto you*, and make another say of her that she repented

The *eels* she hatch'd were not effected. 5. 5. 60.

It need hardly be said that practically every word in Koenig's enormous list occurs also in positions where the full pronunciation is required even with the ten-syllable scansion. We are to believe, therefore, that two kinds of English were habitually spoken by the same characters and in the same scene on Shakespeare's stage, the one a poet's carefully syllabised English, and the other that which we associate rather with the 'Waterloo House young man.' As the *Saturday Review* once said of an author's style, 'if anyone likes this sort of thing, this is the sort of thing he would like'; but one must ask for better reasons than have been offered before believing that either Shakespeare or his public would have approved of it.

It is contended that the First Folio supports the disyllabic theory. That it does so to a considerable extent an opponent may readily grant, though it must be in the spirit of

Yes, forsooth, I wish you joy o' the worm;

for in fact the Folio gives disyllabism its death-blow. To take but one play, F_1 of *Richard III*, as compared with Q_1, embodies some additions and divergences evidently made by Shakespeare himself, but it exhibits other variations which are no less obviously due to another hand. Among these changes I count 102 made solely with an eye to the metre, of which I take 8 to be assignable to the poet, while the origin of some seems uncertain; but it is of 63 made in order to abolish a trisyllabic foot or otherwise superfluous syllable that I now wish to speak[1]. It is incredible that the resolutions should not be genuine in the Quartos, and equally incredible that Shakespeare should thus have put his own clock back, for back it is; that question, however, is beside my present point, which is this. It is quite clear that the reviser of the text from which the Folio was printed, *whether Shakespeare or another*, found many trisyllabic feet and superfluous syllables which he set himself to eliminate; but if the recognised stage pronunciation in the following examples, for instance, was *eels*, *perpechal*, *treach'rous*, *Bucknam*, why did he make the change? *There was nothing to alter.*

Q. Of these supposéd | evils, to | give me leave. 1. 2. 76.
F. Of these supposed crimes, to give me leave.
Q. To his ⁝ new | kingdom | of per|petual | rest. 2. 2. 46.
F. To his new kingdom of ne'er-changing night.
Q. Thy ⁝ age con|firm'd—proud, | subtle, | bloody, | treacherous||. 4. 4. 171.
F. Thy age confirm'd—proud, subtle, sly, and bloody.
Q. My ⁝ lord, the | army | of the | duke of | Buckingham||. 4. 4. 508.
F. My lord, the army of great Buckingham.

(*Sly* after *subtle*, and *ne'er-changing night* in this context, are delightfully grotesque, while *great* is not an epithet of Buckingham which the messenger would have dared to use to Richard on that occasion.) Similar evidence is furnished by all the other plays of which we have Quartos, excepting *Per.*, *M. W. W.*, *M. Ado.*, *L. L. L.*, which do not furnish any material. The present scrutiny alone, then, to say nothing of other evidence which will emerge later, conclusively proves that although the author or authors of the readings under discussion agree with the disyllabists in believing the heroic line to be better without resolutions, and may represent what was probably the prevailing view in Shakespeare's days, that view was certainly not his. It may be added that, as is well known, no reliance can be placed on the use of the apostrophe (in *th'*, *to't*, *to's*, *for's*, *know'st*, *think'st* etc.) in the early texts and especially F_1, since it is quite arbitrary and casual, and sometimes even produces an unmetrical line.

Let us return to the prosodists who willingly admit resolution of the foot in their 'iambo-trochaico-anapaestic' scheme, and give the scansion indicated on pp. 158 f. above[2]. We see that the original scheme, being found inapplicable to thousands of lines, has been so modified by the introduction of new and contradictory feet that it is now unrecognisable. The most conspicuous and startling of these intruders is the trochee, since its rhythm is precisely the opposite of that selected as the base of the system. In some lines, as (*a*), it nearly ousts the iambus altogether, and would hardly leave a trace of it in (*g*) (*k*), and none in (*m*), but for what looks like sheer perversity. All these four lines cry aloud that they are trochaic with or without resolutions, and the iambus seems to be admitted simply for the purpose of 'savee facee.' In Shakespeare alone the type certainly forms an embarrassing phalanx of what Bacon calls *instantiae contradictoriae.* Other indispensable features consist in the assumption of one or even two 'hypermetrical' syllables at the end of numberless lines, and of the omission of a syllable at the beginning of many others. For this last device, called 'initial truncation,' Dr Saintsbury proposes a curious and equally impossible alternative—'strong monosyllabic anacrusis' (see p. 164 and footnote there).

---

[1] I shall be happy to send the complete list to anyone who cares to see it.

[2] The principal recent expositions of this scheme are Saintsbury's *History of English Prosody* (3 vols. 8vo), and *Manual of English Prosody*, and J. B. Mayor's *Chapters on English Metre* (8vo) and *A Handbook of Modern English Metres.*

As representing what we understand by 'measure,' the iambo-trochaico-anapaestic system is obviously a no-system, a mere patch-work the very title of which one would have expected to awaken misgivings. For the substitution of the trochee *no justification or precedent,* so far as I am aware, *has ever been offered.* As to the other feet employed, the spondee is not ––́ but –̋–́, a 4-time measure with two stresses, the stronger of which is on the first; and the anapaest is not ⏑ ⏑ –́ but ⏑̋ ⏑ –́, also a 4-time measure and stressed similarly to the spondee. The amphibrach ⏑ –́ ⏑, again, is a 4-time measure; it denotes a prose rhythm only, and was not used by the ancients as a metrical foot. None of these, therefore, could alternate with 3-time measures such as ⏑ – and – ⏑. Lastly, the tribrach is ⏑́ ⏑ ⏑, not ⏑ ⏑́ ⏑. And what has become of *continuity of rhythm* when stresses are assigned hap-hazard to the last or first or middle syllable of the feet of a measure?

The effect of 'inversion' upon hundreds of lines is to rob them of a foot. For instance, the prosodists may give us on paper,

∧ Knéel | thou dówn | Phílip, | but ríse | more greát ||,

but when the line is *uttered* we hear,

Knéel thou dỏwn | Phílip, but | ríse more | greát ∧ | – ⏑ ||:

down has become a slightly stressed irrational long in a resolved foot, and we have a 4-foot line on a trochaic base. It is only by marking a pause after *down* that we can get five feet and show the line's true rhythm:

Knéel thou | dówn ∧ | Phílip, but | ríse more | greát ∧ ||.

If this is not enough, there is yet another result, which should give this monstrosity its *coup de grâce.* The Greek poets, the delicacy of whose ear will hardly be questioned, used a measure called the *dochmiac*, which is composed of two unequal feet, a bacchius (–̋ –́ ⏑) and a trochee. It began with an anacrustic syllable ⏑, and might be either 'full' or 'checked': ⏑ ⁝ – – ⏑ | – ⏑ || or ⏑ ⁝ – – ⏑ | – ∧ ||. The value of the measure lay in its irregularity; and as presenting the greatest conceivable contrast to the smoothness of all even measures, it was invented and employed solely to express the extreme of passionate emotion—uncontrollable grief, agitation, fury, distress. Our own poets have, I believe, never used the measure even in experiments, but the prosodists give it to us in line after line. When they scan (*K. J.* 1. 1. 193),

> My pĭ́ck'd | mán of | coúntries : | 'My dĕ́ar | sír,'
> Thus, leán|ing on my elbow, I begin,

they make us utter, with delightful incongruity, two full dochmiacs in succession:

> Mў ⁝ pīck'd mān ŏf | coūntrĭes: || 'Mў ⁝ dēar sīr,' thŭs, | leānĭng ||.

The following specimens are also from *K. J.*:—*and roúgh* | *frówn of* | *wár* ∧; *that láw* | *bár no* | *wróng* ∧; *and loud churlish drums*; *the fat ribs of peace.* The play is made to exhibit about a dozen perfect examples, while of course the dochmiac's characteristic irregularity vexes the ear with every inversion that brings two longs together.

It was said above that the Greek iambic line is now scanned in feet which have their stress on the first syllable; the same is true of all Greek measures, and this seems to be the natural mode of division. It was the method instinctively adopted when music was first written down in bars, although many musical themes begin with an unstressed note; and considering the close analogy between music and verse, to mark off the units of a verse measure otherwise seems as *un*natural as it would be to divide the notes of a waltz into bars each of which begins with the third beat. Now, there frequently occurs in Greek poetry a 5-foot measure with a trochaic base which is demonstrably the measure to which our heroic line is written. Its norm is

⏑ ⁝ – ⏑ | – ⏑ | – ⏑ | – ⏑ | – ⏑ ||.

The introductory syllable, marked off by the sign ⁝, although an invariable adjunct of some Greek measures, is in many (including this pentapody) inserted or omitted at pleasure in successive lines; just as in music a recurrent theme sometimes appears with an introductory note and sometimes without. It is called, from the analogy of the musical conductor's baton, the *anacrusis* or *upbeat*. Being an upbeat, it does not take stress (or not more than the secondary stress of measures that have two), and must not exceed in length the unstressed part of the measure to which it is attached[1]. Thus in a measure of triple time, like this one, it must not be longer than ◡. It may however, be an irrational long, or it may consist of two half-shorts (◡◡ = ◡). The opening lines of *Horatius* afford an excellent illustration:

Làrs ⋮ Porsen|a of | Clusium, ||
Bý the nìne | gods hè | swore ∧ ||
That the ⋮ great | house of | Tarquin ||
Shoùld ⋮ suffer | wrong no | moré ∧ ||.

The 1st, 2nd, and 4th lines show the irrational, and the 3rd the double upbeat.

The following variations are normal both in the Greek line and our own: (1) the long of the trochee is protracted to the time of 3 shorts, forming a monosyllabic foot ∟, as in v. 3 of *Horatius*; (2) the trochee is resolved into (*a*) the triplet dactyl –◡ ◡, the syllables of which have the values 1½, ½, 1; or (*b*) the tribrach ◡́ ◡ ◡; or (*c*) the unnamed – ◡◡, a long and two half-shorts; or (*d*) occasionally into a quadrisyllabic foot. (The triplet dactyl is to be distinguished from the true 4-time dactyl –̋ ◡́ ◡, which has two stresses.) The resolutions are exemplified by *furious, pitiful, dead for a* (*ducat!*), and *marry, to con*(*fess*).

The Greeks used indifferently and in succession (*a*) the full measure, which is that of the *Divina Commedia,*

Nel ⋮ mezzo | del cam|min di | nostra | vita, ||

and of lines like

I ⋮ come to | bury | Caesar, | not to | praise him ||,

and (*b*) the 'checked' line with the last foot incomplete, as

But ⋮ let them | measure | us by | what they | will, ∧ ||
We'll ⋮ measure | them a | measure | ànd be | gone. ∧ ||

Our own poets do the same, but for good reasons use chiefly the checked line, employing the other only as a variety.

The notion that the last syllable of the full measure is 'hypermetrical' and a 'licence' is, as we now see, in plain opposition to the fact, if any weight is to be attached to the various evidence that is forced upon us. The unmistakable view of our poets will emerge more plainly when we come to examine their verse in detail, and one wonders whether Dr Saintsbury felt no qualms as to his logic when he wrote on this point,

---

[1] Dr Saintsbury falls into disastrous error on this point, which is of fundamental importance. He strangely mistranslates *anacrusis* by 'push-off or take-off,' and so, to take a single illustration, describes the line *Phĭl|lida floúts* | *mé* (for so he scans and recites!) as having an 'anacrusis of one strong monosyllable' (*H. E. P.* vol. II, p. 336), thus giving to his anacrusis *Phil-* a stress equal to that of the ictus of the measure and in effect making it into a whole foot. *His whole system is largely based on this astounding mistake.*

> The first of these features probably, and the most insidious, but also the most *revolutionary*, is the redundant syllable. It is of an *ancient house*; we had ourselves fifteeners *before we had fourteeners*, and in all prosodies from the Greeks downwards there has been a tendency to regard the last place in a line as a place of licence and liberty. It is a *sort of 'breath'* only, something you do not count, but just *smuggle in* with its companion[1].

If the Fifteeners (to transfer the name from the verse to its writers), following the habit of an ancient house, were engaged in importing this sort of breath openly, as they were, they can hardly have expected or wished to escape observation, and it seems unfair to call their practice smuggling. Such breaths are things that anyone might notice. Nor can they have been revolutionaries; the term belongs rather to the Fourteeners, who interfered with what had hitherto been regarded as legitimate trade. To speak in plain prose, it is obvious that what the latter did was to dock the line in vogue of a syllable which, so far from being hypermetrical, was clearly an integral part of its final trochee.

As Chaucer had done before him, Shakespeare at once developed in his handling of the measure every variation with which the Greek line had been embellished. For instance, we find in so early a play as *Love's Labour's Lost*,

How will he | scorn ! ∧ | how will he | spend his | wit ! ∧ ||
I be ⁝ seech you, a | word : ∧ | what is | she in the | white ? ∧ ||

His ear for music recognised, as Chaucer's had done, the rhythmical beauty of the resolved foot, and so far was he from seeking to avoid it, that *he used it with ever-increasing frequency*, often introducing a quadrisyllabic, and in four cases a quinquesyllabic; while he frequently gives us a trisyllable even in the final foot, as Macaulay does in the first line of *Horatius*. One feature he added which is not found in Greek poetry —a pause within the line of the time of a short syllable, as in the two lines just quoted. This is to be distinguished from the lengthening of – to └, and is similar to the normal omission of the measure's final syllable.

Before proceeding to show by examples and point by point the trochaic structure of our measure, and incidentally its remarkable identity with the Greek prototype, it may be well to forestall some possible objections and misapprehensions.

It may be laid down as indisputable that the rhythm of verse corresponds to that of music; conceivably at least, all verse could be set to music without change of its rhythms. But in music that is properly interpreted it continually happens that of half-a-dozen consecutive bars no two take up exactly the same amount of time, while the notational values of the individual notes will be habitually departed from at least to some small extent. So it is in the utterance of verse (and we must remember that all verse is meant to be spoken aloud), but with much greater latitude; one foot will take the normal length of time, one or two or more will be said more slowly, others faster. Again, we use—our language compels us to use, a large number of 'irrationals,' and individual words with a significance that needs to be brought into relief occur far more often than is the case with individual notes of music. Owing to these two facts combined, the spoken – ◡ will often become a true spondee –̋ –́, with a considerable stress on the second syllable; and the resolved foot will undergo even greater modification, though it will never fail to be recognisable as being approximately of one of the four types mentioned above. Nevertheless the rhythm is always preserved, because we find no difficulty in distributing the normal stresses. There are of course limits to the use of heavy irrationals, but within those limits we may say that the measure was made for the poet, not the poet for the measure. Although therefore we may, in order to facilitate explanation, legitimately apply the musical or quantitative notation of – and ◡ to verse, we do not imply that the movement of verse is in all respects similar to that of music. The remark may seem needless, but it is important; for many people deny that English poetry can be usefully marked off in this manner simply from a failure to recognise the compatibility of two facts,—that on the one hand the movement of verse is essentially *orderly*, is in fact a *rhythm*, and on the other, that the time-values of the quantitative notation are not slavishly and inartistically observed when the words are spoken aloud.

---

[1] *H. E. P.* vol. II, p. 50. The italics are mine.

These remarks may be briefly illustrated. In saying the line,

> To sleep; perchance to dream: ay there's the rub:

we retain almost exactly the true musical values of the syllables, but at the same time we depart from the more even flow of music by making long pauses at *sleep* and *dream*, and a short one after *ay*. But the spoken trochee often becomes a pyrrhic (◡́ ◡):

> Elaine the fair, Elaine the | lova|ble,
> Elaine the | lily | maid of Astolat,
> High in her chamber | up a | tower to the east.

This, however, and the fact that the foot sometimes becomes an apparent spondee, should not lead us to call the rhythm of English poetry 'duple' that is, to regard the normal unit as – –̣ rather than –⏑, as Mr Omond is inclined to do; the prevailing character of our verse as a whole, and of these lines in a remarkable degree, forbids such a view. The phenomenon often occurs in music, as when we get two quavers replacing a triplet. Mr Omond's difficulty would probably disappear with recognition of the irrational long. This syllable is sometimes so heavy that, as was said above, the foot as spoken becomes a true spondee, as in Macbeth's *Máking the | grëen óne | rëd.* Similarly the last syllable of a triplet dactyl is not infrequently heavy, as in the third foot of the line,

Is a ⋮ sharp | wit | match'd with too | blunt a will. *L. L. L.* 2.1.49.

Lastly, it is common for the first syllable of a foot to take no stress at all; to which music again affords a parallel.

What has been said here is of no little importance for yet another reason,—that without an appreciation of the *musical* rhythm of verse, effective utterance of it is unattainable; it will sound like prose. We may now proceed with our illustrations.

THE TROCHAIC SCHEME ILLUSTRATED.

We have seen that the trochaic system is at any rate sound in principle. It provides the first and strictly indispensable requisite for any prosodic scheme—continuity of rhythm. It places the stress where by Greek precedent and musical analogy it should be, on the first syllable of the foot; it explains why the initial syllable of the line is sometimes stressed and sometimes not; and it accounts for the presence of three or even more syllables in the foot, as a natural resolution of the trochee on principles familiar to us in music. It also explains how two stressed syllables can occur together through the protraction of the long in a monosyllabic foot, and it relieves us of the necessity of bringing against the poets the unfounded charge that they habitually violate their measure by 'smuggling in' a 'redundant' syllable or syllables at the end. We have now to submit the system to the crucial test of application: does it work? For this purpose let us examine the handling of the heroic line by four of its greatest masters, taking the features of the scheme one by one[1].

---

[1] In the following pages S. at the end of a line quoted indicates Shakespeare, M. Milton, T. Tennyson, and Sw. Swinburne.

1. *The Upbeat.* The proportion of lines without upbeat appears to be nearly as follows: in Shakespeare, Milton, and Tennyson 1 in 5; in Swinburne's *Atalanta* 1 in 4. The omission, which seems to occur whenever it is convenient, may be made for the purpose of giving great or moderate emphasis to the first word, as in *Brutus will start a spirit as soon as Caesar*; but often there is no emphasis at all, as when the Nurse asks Juliet, *Have you got leave to go to shrift to-day?* The effect of the mere omission (i.e. without resolution of the first foot) upon short measures is remarkable; as a rule it gives additional liveliness and energy, as in *L'Allegro*, where nearly half the lines have no upbeat. In *Il Penseroso* the proportion of omission to insertion is only 1 to 4, as we should expect. On the other hand, if the subject and language are solemn, the omission adds to the solemnity, as in the hymn, *Rock of Ages, cleft for me.* A 5-foot line usually loses in liveliness if it has no upbeat, unless the first foot is resolved; and even a short succession of pentapodies beginning – ⏑ – ⏑ would be disagreeable if the rhythm had not an obvious purpose, as in Tennyson's *Vision of Sin*, II, and perhaps in the Wellington Ode, VIII. Accordingly, when the upbeat is wanting in our measure, the first foot is almost always resolved, and lines like the following are comparatively rare:

(*a*) If I | talk to him, | with his innocent prate. S.
(*b*) Tantae | ne ani | mis cae | lestibus | irae? S. 2 *Hen. VI*, 2. 1. 24.
(*c*) Uni | versal re | proach, far worse to bear. M.
(*d*) Now to | glorious | burial slowly borne. T.
(*e*) Tracks, and | gains on him, | scenting sins far off. Sw.
(*f*) Well, ∧ | Suffolk, thou | shalt not see me blush. S.
(*g*) Senseless | linen! | happier there | in than I. S.
(*h*) Tell the | clock there. | Give me a | calendar. S.
(*j*) One word | more, good | lady. | —What shall I | do? S.
(*k*) Yes, for | sooth, I | wish you | joy o' the | worm. S.
(*l*) Quick, dis | patch, and | send the | head to | Angelo ||. S.

It will be observed that in the first six examples the line is at once relieved by a resolved foot. There are over 180 similar examples in Shakespeare, and 10 in Milton's *Samson*. Sometimes two trochees precede the resolution, as in (*g*) and (*h*), and of this I count in Shakespeare 82 instances. More rarely he postpones the resolution to the 4th foot, as in (*j*) and (*k*), giving of this rhythm perhaps not more than 22 examples. In (*l*) the final foot alone is resolved. In Swinburne 5-foot lines beginning with a trochee are extremely rare.

Among the lines without upbeat there are two types which have a special interest from the fact that they happen to be identical with two Greek measures, the *Phalaeceus hendecasyllabus* and the *Sapphic.* The former, commonly called the *hendecasyllabic*, is a pentapody with one resolution only, in the 2nd foot, and with the last foot completed. Shakespeare gives 30 examples, as

> Brother, | give me thy | hand ; and, gentle Warwick.
> Villains, | answer you | so the lord protector ?

In Milton I have noted two, both in choruses of *Samson :*

> Uni | versally | crowned with highest praises. (175)
> O, how comely it is and how reviving. (1268)

Of the Sapphic, – ⏑ | – ⏑ | ∽ ⏑ | – ⏑ | – ⏑ ||, Shakespeare gives at least 25 instances, but I have not noticed it in Milton[1]:

> What may you be ? | Are you of | good or evil ? *O.* 5. 1. 65.
> Some time | I shall | sléep out, the | rest I'll | whistle. *Lear*, 2. 2. 163.

The occurrence of lines without upbeat, constituting as they do quite a fifth of all the heroic lines written, should of itself be sufficient to establish the trochaic base ; but if further proof is needed, we find it in yet another variety of them which seems to settle the matter decisively. I mean such pure trochaic lines as

> Never, never, never, never, never. *Lear*, 5. 3. 308.
> Never, never ! Come, away, away ! *J. C.* 3. 2. 258.
> Hear you, master steward, where's our master ? *Timon*, 4. 2. 1.
> O this learning, what a thing it is !
> O this woodcock, what an ass it is ! *T. S.* 1. 2. 160 f.
> Come, sir, we will better it in Pisa. *T. S.* 4. 4. 71.
> Come, good fellow, put mine iron on. *A. and C.* 4. 4. 3.
> While their hearts were jocund and sublime. *Samson*, 1669.
> Thea ! Thea ! Thea ! where is Saturn ? Keats, *Hyperion*.

Of such lines I count in Marlowe's seven plays 66, and in all Shakespeare's 172, but I may have missed one or two. The much greater proportion in Marlowe's work. or what passes for his, is instructive, as is also the distribution of the type among the genuine and disputed plays of Shakespeare. Such lines are characteristic of a versification not yet perfected ; and although, with their blunt beginning and the absence of resolutions, they are effective in their proper place and when used sparingly, they tend to disappear as the playwright's craftsmanship improves[2]. My count gives for Shakespeare : *T. S.*, *J. C.* 14 ; *Per.*

---

[1] The Alcaic, ⏑ ⋮ – ⏑ | – ⏑ | ∽ ⏑ | – ⏑ | – ∧ ||, is fairly frequent both in Shakespeare and Milton ; there are eleven instances in *Temp.* i. 2, and five in *Samson*.

[2] In *The First Part of the Contention betwixt the Two Famous Houses* etc., which was first published in 1594 and is the original of 2 *Henry VI*, I find in the first 1000 lines or so 15 such verses, and 12 beginning with two or three trochees. In its sequel *The True*

13; 1 *Hen. VI*, 9; *T. G.*, *R. II*, *Macb.*, 8 each; *Lear*, *Timon*, *Ham.*, 7; *M. M.*, 2 *Hen. VI*, *Hen. VIII*, 6 each; *Temp.*, 1 *Hen. IV*, 3 *Hen. VI*, *Titus*, *Cymb.*, 5 each; *Cor.*, 4. The other plays show 3, 2, 1 or none; I have noticed none in *M. W. W.*, *M. N. D.*, and *Hen. V.* Similar short lines also occur; there are for instance 5 in *Lear*. The total of pentapodies beginning with a trochee in Shakespeare's plays is over 450. In Chaucer's *Knightes Tale* there are as many as 25, an average of one line in 90.

If the mere existence of these lines does not convince us that their authors, known or unknown, must have scanned all their blank verse on a trochaic base, we must suppose that they adopted it occasionally in pure caprice. The prosodists, however, will not admit the base even for these lines; they tell us that *the first syllable of the initial iambus is omitted!* But we must reply that this, like the device of reversed stress, is only another bit of legerdemain. Such an 'omission' is incredible and unheard-of. There is another point too, which seems to have been overlooked, although it is of cardinal importance. It is all very well to *print* '∧ Come, good fellow,' but the words were primarily written to be *spoken on the stage*, and how can the actor indicate the omission before he has begun the line? A bibulous Antony might indeed start with a hiccup in order to suggest the iambic scansion,

> uc! Come, good fellow, put mine iron on,

but as a rule, even a gasp or a stammer would be hardly in place. Yet without some such elegant trick *the actor must in each case utter a plain trochaic line.* This, the effect on the ear, is the only test, and there is no escape from it.

2. *The Disyllabic Upbeat* is frequent in all the poets; I have noted 42 instances in *Hamlet*, 41 in *Othello*, 26 in *Macbeth*, 96 in *Lear*. More often than not it is followed in Shakespeare by a monosyllabic foot, as in *With a : bare | bodkin—Let him : go, ∧ | Gertrude—With the : Moor,*

Tragedie etc. (1595), the original of 3 *Hen. VI*, I count only 13 pure trochaic lines in the whole. It is interesting and instructive to compare

> Í, now | lookes he like a king?
> Thís is | he that tooke king Henries chaire. *True Tragedie*, 1. 4. 80 f.

with

> Ay, marry, sir, now looks he like a king!
> Ay, this is he that took King Henry's chair. 3 *Hen. VI*, 1. 4. 96.

and

> Í, if | thoú saie | I to my request,
> No, if thou saie no to my demand. *True Tragedie*, 3. 2. 59 f.

with

> Ay, if | thou wilt say | 'ay' to my request,
> No, if | thou dost say | 'no' to my demand. 3 *Hen. VI*, 3. 2. 79 f.

∧ | *say'st thou?* In Swinburne's verse, owing to his love for resolutions, it is very common.

3. *The Irrational Long* sometimes takes a slight emphasis:

> Of ⋮ whóse trùe-|fix'd and resting quality. S.
> Bálm of hùrt | minds, great nature's second course. S.

4. *The Full Measure.*—Completion of the last foot is normal, and resolution of it occurs in Shakespeare with some frequency. I have noted about 150 instances, not counting the large number composed of proper names, of which there are 54 in *Antony and Cleopatra* alone. Of the 150 *Lear* gives 21, *Henry VIII* 20, *Tempest* and *A. and C.* 17 each, *Cymbeline* 15; the other plays fewer. Examples are:

> With ⋮ many | heads | butts me a|way. ∧ | Nay, mother. *Cor.* 4. 1. 2.
> O ⋮ monstrous | act! ∧ | —Villany! | villany! | villany! *O.* 5. 2. 190.
> Eros!—I | come, my | queen.—∧ | Eros!— | Stay for me. *A. and C.* 4. 14. 50.
> But his ⋮ neat | cookery! he | cut our | roots in | characters. *Cymb.* 4. 2. 49.

Beaumont and Fletcher, in imitation, exhibit the feature *ad nauseam.*

5. *Resolution.*—The resolved foot, which may take any of the forms already mentioned, has been a feature of our heroic line from its infancy. In Act i of Sackville and Norton's *Gorboduc*, the first dramatic blank verse published (1565), there is an average of 3 resolutions in every 17 lines; for example,

> The realme divided | into two | sondry partes.
> Stoode in the | likeli|hode to pos|sesse the whole.

In Act 4 there is a quadrisyllabic,

> With Serpentes | girt, ∧ | carrying the | whip of ire.

In Chaucer's *Prologue* there is an average of more than one resolution in every 5 lines. In the plays of Shakespeare's maturity the average is 1 in 1½ to 2 lines, and sometimes there are two or even three or four in one line. In *Lear* there are 147 resolutions in 257 lines. His resolution of the 5th foot has just been noticed in § 4, and it is quite common for the 4th foot to be resolved:

> Look where he | goes, even | now, ∧ | out at the | portal.
> Next, your | son gone, and | he most | violent | author.
> Seize upon | Fife; ∧ | give to the | edge o' the | sword.
> Was he not | born of | woman? The | spirits that | know.
> Dearly, my delicate Ariel. Do not approach.

The traditional scansion freely obscures the presence of resolutions to the eye, though of course not to the ear. Thus, if we scan, *What is* | *amiss?* | — *You are,* | *and do* | *not know* ‖ *it,* the line appears to have no resolved foot; yet in fact it contains two: *What is a*|*miss?* ∧ | —*You are, and* | *do not* | *know it.*

It is important to notice that when an irrational in a resolved foot is heavy, rhythmical utterance of the words is often assisted either by a pause in the sense, or by the pause one naturally makes after a word to give it emphasis, as in

> Dost thou | hear?—Your | tale, sir, woùld | cure | deafness.
> Thou call'dst me up at | midnìght to | fetch | dew.

In Milton, who as a rule, composes the foot of syllables very easy to say, resolution is almost equally common; in *P. L.* I the average is 1 in $2\frac{1}{9}$ lines. There are two in the opening line,

> Of ⁝ man's | first diso|bedience | and the fruit,

and, as in Shakespeare, occasionally three in one line:

> Fled ⁝ over | Adria | to the Hes|perian | fields.

Tennyson has an unmistakable liking for the resolution and is at pains to introduce it for effect:

> In cataract after cataract to the sea.
> Prick'd with incredible pinnacles into heaven.
> O Galahad, and O Galahad, follow me.

Swinburne's love for the resolved foot is a veritable passion. In one passage in *Atalanta* there are 119 in 167 lines, and in another as many as 90 in 104 lines. Nineteen of these lines have two resolutions each, and in the former passage there are three having three each, and in the latter one such line. The effect produced by this accumulation is further heightened by the presence of quadrisyllabics, as in

> Seeing thine | head | glitter and thine | hand | burn its way, (Alex.)

and by frequent double upbeats. The line has in fact become almost lyric, and is so different in character from the Shakespearean line, to say nothing of Milton's, that it might seem to belong to another metre. For although the blank verse of both the older poets is continually beautified by rhythms essentially lyric[1], Swinburne's line exhibits this variation of the norm to an extent beyond that which in their judgement marked the desirable limit. Nevertheless it is not weaker. On the contrary, there is a gain of strength in a new direction, and the total result of this animation of the measure, reinforced as it is by frequent alliteration, is remarkable. There are in the play plenty of stately lines without resolution, yet not enough to stamp their character predominantly upon the whole; and while these lend dignity and nobility to the dialogue, the new line, which is full of emotion, conveys by its frequency an overruling impression of impetuosity and passion. Its effect is something like that of the galliambic. Examples are

---

[1] See pp. 175 ff. *infra*.

Sunlike with many a Nereid's hair, and moved.
Through a heavy and iron furrow of sundering spears.
For silver nor | bright | snow nor feather of foam
Was whiter and no gold heavier than thine hair.
Where, hid by heavier hyacinth, violet buds
Blossom and burn; and fire of yellower flowers.
They are strong, they are strong; I am broken, and these prevail.

6. *The Quadrisyllabic Foot.*—The frequency of this foot in Shakespeare is sufficient to show what was his feeling about resolved feet in general; there are, for instance, 18 each in *Hamlet* and *The Tempest*, 24 in *Lear*, 26 in *Othello*, 55, besides 2 quinquesyllabics, in *Cymbeline.*

The curi|osity of | nations to deprive me.
Mumbling of wicked | charms, ∧ | conjuring the | moon.
'Fiery'? | whát, ∧ | 'quality'? Why, | Gloucester, Gloucester.
Fiery? the | fiery | duke? ∧ | Tell the hot duke that—
The body's | delicate: the | tempest in my mind.
To every several man ∧ | seventy-five | drachmas.

Abbott would scan the last line,

To ev'|ry sev'|ral man | se'nt'-fíve | dráchmas ||. *or*
To ev'|ry sev'|ral man | sé'nty–|five dréch||mas.

Thus we are asked to believe that the actor who took the rôle of the incomparable orator Antony was expected by Shakespeare to deliver this important and weighty line, every syllable of which should tell, with 'slurring' or 'quasi-suppression' (Abbott) or actual elision (Koenig and others) of three if not four of its vowels, obscuring especially the precise sum of money to be given, which is equivalent to about £3.

It should be noticed that in Shakespeare the foot is often broken by a necessary or natural pause before the third or fourth syllable. In effect (and purpose) we have two short measures in the line, and the last or two last syllables of the quadrisyllabic form an upbeat for the second, as in

But his ⋮ neat | cookery! || he ⋮ cut our | roots in | characters. *Cymb.* 4. 2. 48.

In each of the four following lines, which would be spoiled by being delivered as Alexandrines, we have a quinquesyllabic foot, and there are probably more in the plays:

Might ⋮ easiliest | harbour in? Thou blessed thing! *Cymb.* 4. 2. 206.
Murderous to the | senses? That confirms it home. *Cymb.* 4. 2. 329.
So ⋮ tediously a|way. The | poor con|demn'd | English. *H. V.* Act 4, Prol. 22.
Action is | eloquence, and the | eyes of the | igno|rant. *Cor.* 3. 2. 76.

The following line of Tennyson shows both a quadrisyllabic and a quinquesyllabic:

Muttering and | murmuring at his | ear, ∧ | ‘Quick ! | Quick !’

In Milton also the foot is frequent; there are 22 in *P. L.* II and 19 in *Samson*:

Wallowing un|wieldy, enormous in their gait.
Irre|coverably | dark, ∧ | total eclipse.

In Tennyson and Swinburne the foot is quite common, and often a thing of beauty:

Ruining a | long the il | limit | able in | ane. T.
Galloping of | horses over the grassy plain. T.
Glittering as | wine and moving as a wave. Sw.

7. *The Monosyllabic Foot.*—(*a*) A long syllable protracted to the time-value of a whole foot, usually for emphasis, but not always; or (*b*) the apparent deficiency of a short syllable accounted for by a pause of the voice. Both these features are common in the four poets under consideration, as also in Shelley, Keats, and Browning. I count an average of 1 in 7 lines in *The Tempest*, 1 in 9 in *Hamlet*, 1 in 7½ in *Macbeth*, and over 300 in *Lear*; in Milton *P. L.* I and II and *Samson* 1 in 14; in *Comus* 1 in 8; in Keats' *Hyperion* over 1 in 10; in Tennyson's *Idylls* 1 in 15 (but in particular idylls it is much more frequent); in Swinburne's *Atalanta* 1 in 5. The foot is usually followed by a resolution in order to ease the rhythm, but in Shakespeare a monosyllabic 4th foot is quite common.

The very | stones | prate of my whereabouts. S.
Than the ⁝ soft | myrtle : but | man, ∧ | proud | man. S.
Igno|miny in | ransom and | free | pardon
Are of | two | houses : lawful mercy. S.
Nor Cymbe|line ∧ | dream that they | are alive. S.
But not ap|proach’d. ∧ | All is | well | yet. S.
A ⁝ mind | not to be | changed by time or place. M.
Waiting re|venge. ∧ | Cruel his eye, but cast. M.
Whereby the | blood | beats, and the blossom blows,
And the ⁝ sea | rolls, and all the world is warm’d. T.
And the ⁝ long | brand | blackens, and | white | dust. Sw.
And thy ⁝ mouth | shuddering | like a | shot | bird. Sw.

In a line like the last we seem to have reached the utmost of the measure’s possibilities; but the iambic system breaks down on it.

The monosyllabic foot, which is common in all Browning’s verse, occurs with remarkable frequency in *The Ring and the Book*, and not having been recognised[1], has given rise to the notion that the work is full of careless and unmetrical lines. Thus Dr Mayor is horrified by the 'inexcusable harshness or slovenliness' which he discovers (*Handbook*, p. 120). It would be truer to say that, being unsurpassed in his mastery of measures, the poet has here concealed his art with too much success. I give three examples out of eleven taken from the first 100 lines of *Pompilia*:

---

[1] See, however, a valuable article by the late Dr Verrall in the *National Home-reading Union Magazine*, Jan. and Feb., 1908.

> I am ⋮ just | seventeen years and five months old,
> And, if I lived one day | more, ∧ | three full weeks.
> He will ⋮ seem | hardly more than a | great | boy.

It is, indeed, no small part of the indictment to be made against our prosody, that it compels its champions to boggle over line after line of English poetry, and causes them to condemn or misrepresent many that are both rhythmically and metrically faultless. One of several extraordinary instances will be found in Dr Saintsbury's *H. E. P.* vol. II, pp. 231 ff. Dr Mayor's two books are similarly sown broadcast with painful failures.

It was said above (p. 172) that Shakespeare's blank verse habitually exhibits rhythms that are essentially lyric. In order to justify the statement, I must ask the reader to make a very brief excursion into Greek prosody.

Besides the plain lyric measures of two or more unresolved feet, the Greeks used the following among many others.

Dipody: (α) ⏖ ⏑ | – ⏑ ‖, always without upbeat.
Tripodies: (β) ⏖ ⏑ | – ⏑ | – ⏑ ‖ (1st foot resolved).
(γ) – ⏑ | ⏖ ⏑ | – ⏑ ‖ (2nd foot resolved).
Tetrapodies: (δ) ⏖ ⏑ | – ⏑ | – ⏑ | – ⏑ ‖ (1st foot resolved).
(ε) – ⏑ | ⏖ ⏑ | – ⏑ | – ⏑ ‖ (2nd foot resolved)[1].

All these were used full or 'checked,' and singly or in combination. The tripodies and tetrapodies sometimes took upbeat, and were occasionally varied by an additional resolution and the introduction of monosyllabic feet.

It is not a little remarkable that Shakespeare's blank verse, especially in the plays which present it in its fullest perfection, frequently falls into one or other of these measures. I do not mean to imply that he borrowed them from a Greek or Latin source, which would be a possible but needless supposition; I would merely point out that his ear undoubtedly recognised and distinguished them, and that he must have employed them with intention. His types differ from the Greek only in that he sometimes has a quadrisyllabic, and sometimes gives the *Adonius* an upbeat. If we have ever wondered what it is that makes his dramatic verse so musical, we find here a further secret than that of its ever-changing tone-colour; its movement is continually diversified by these unmistakable lyric rhythms, which are yet so tempered with the plain sequences that the dignity of the verse is unimpaired. We have in the result that exquisitely varied music which our prosody has so long done its best to stifle.

---

[1] (α) *Versus Adonius*, but not so called when 'checked'; (β) 1*st Pherecratean*; (γ) 2*nd Pherecratean*; (δ) 1*st Glyconic*; (ε) 2*nd Glyconic*.

In the following illustrations the measures which reproduce the Greek ones are referred to by the Greek letters by which they are distinguished above, and the arabic numerals denote plain measures according to the number of their feet. Thus

To be, or not to be : ∧ || that is the question. (3 . *a*)

means that the line is composed of 3 unresolved feet of plain measure, ◡ ⋮ – ◡ | – ◡ | –́ ∧ ||, followed by the Greek measure designated above by the letter (α). The *rhythm* of the first six words, as distinct from their scansion, is iambic, but this disappears after the monosyllabic foot, and we have the rhythm ◡́ ◡ ◡ | –́ ◡ ||. We may note here the happy effect of the resolved foot; if we had had *that's the question*, the demonstrative would have received too much emphasis, and the latter part of the line would have been trivial and somewhat dead. We may now proceed with our illustrations. (The sign || marks a change of measure, and is independent of the single lines that mark the scansion.)

As ⋮ mad as the | vex'd | sea, ∧ || singing a|loud ∧ ||. (β . *a*)
What a ⋮ haste | looks through his | eyes ! ∧ || So should he | look. ∧ ||. (γ . *a*)
That my ⋮ keen | knife ∧ || see not the | wound it | makes. (2 . β)
In ⋮ this | time of the | night ! ∧ || Bring him a|way |. (γ . *a*)
Ring the a|larum-|bell. ∧ || Murder and treason ! (β . *a*)
What is a|miss ? ∧ || You are, and | do not | know't ∧ ||. (*a* . β)
Ay, Greek, | that is my | name ∧ ||. (γ)
She is alone the Arabian bird, || and I. (δ varied . 1)
I am : ⋮ ∧ || what must we understand by this ? (1 . δ)
All's ⋮ well, sir : || take my | power i' the | court for | yours ∧ ||. (1 . ε)
Mark it : || the eldest | of them at | three years | old ∧ ||. (1 . ε)

The combination (α . β) or (β . α) is especially common.

The point may be further illustrated by an examination of the structure of his verse periods. It was Shakespeare's constant aim, after his earliest years of production, so to manipulate his verse—by stops in the line, by linking the lines (*enjambement*), and by the introduction of short lines and Alexandrines—that it should not, as uttered, present a monotonous sequence of distinguishable 5-foot lengths. The result is that in its most perfect form it falls upon the ear as a succession of measures of continually varied length, like those of an elaborate lyric. As one listens, it is only occasionally possible to tell where the written line begins and ends. Even the plain talk of a council-room is modulated in this manner:

Duke. There is no composition in these news
That gives them credit. ||
First Sen. Indeed they are disproportioned; ||
My létters say || a hundred and seven galleys. ||
Duke. And mine a hundred and forty. ||
Sec. Sen. And mine two hundred: ||
But though they jump not, on a just account,— ||
As in these | cases, || where the aim reports, ||
'Tis oft with difference— || yet do they all confirm
A Turkish fleet, || and bearing up to Cyprus. *Oth.* i. 3. 1.

In effect the measures of this period are: 7 . β . 2 . β . γ . 2 . 5 . α . 3 . 2 . 5 . 3. Examples meet one at every turn, but I have only space for two more, both short:

To cry to the sea that roar'd to us, || to sigh
To the winds || whose pity, sighing back again, ||
Did us but loving wrong. *Temp.* 1. 2. 149.

Period: δ . α . 4 . β.

Come, leave your tears: || a brief farewell: || the beast
With many | heads ∧ || butts me away. ∧ || Nay,‸ mother,
Where is your ancient courage? *Cor.* 4. 1. 1.

In these two and a half lines we have five separate measures: 2 . 2 . 3 . α . δ varied, and may note especially the skilful use made of the resolved final foot. What an ear the man must have had! And yet there are those who will say that all this is to find in his verse a music that is not there. If the reader cares to look at *Macbeth*, 2. 2. 48–62 ('Why did you bring...green one red'), he will find that allowing for voice-pauses, the passage falls into the following measures: 5 . 2 . 2 . 4 . 2 . β . α . β . 2 . 2 . 3 . α . 6 . α . 5 . β . (*Knocking.*) α . 2 . β . 2 . β . 3 . 4 . 2 . 6 . β.

It remains to consider Dr Saintsbury's peremptory and contemptuous condemnation of the trochaic base, and what he has to say in support of his own view. Such is his infatuation for his iambo-trochaico-anapaestic scheme, that towards the end of his 3rd volume (p. 526) he becomes positively dithyrambic in praise of its charms, not scrupling to parody even the Authorised Version in order to elevate the style:

> But still there abide these three—iamb, trochee, and anapaest—in the English aristocracy of poetry. The iamb is with us the staple of poetic life: it will do any work, take on any colour....The trochee is the passion of life; not easily adaptable by itself, except for special moments, comic or tragic, frivolous or plaintive, but seasoning and inspiring the iamb constantly and yet strangely. And the anapaest is the glory of life, though its uses differ in glory....

As the story of a mortal's passion for a phantom is always a little pathetic, so it is sad to see here so much enthusiasm spent in ecstasies over things that as metrical feet are no more than 'airy nothing.' To two of this ill-assorted trio Metre, as we have seen, refuses an abiding-place or even recognition, and Dr Saintsbury must be content to retain 'the passion of life.' Still he will find the trochee a more satisfactory general servant; it will do more work and put on less incongruous colours than the original staff. At p. 530, impatient with the dulness of those who cannot perceive his innamorata's perfections, he is betrayed into writing not quite politely, 'Some of these trochaisers seem to me to be prosodically rhythm-deaf as other persons are physically colour-blind.'

So much for laudation of the defendant and abuse of the plaintiff's attorney; when we look for argument we find it, for all one can discover, on p. 525, where what is said, if I understand the diagrammatic printing aright, comes to this. If you take the line

stars,
of inauspicious
the yoke
And shake

and scan it ⏑ – | ⏑ – | etc, it invites a 'rising intonation'—the voice seems to be going upstairs; if you scan it with trochaic feet,

And shake the
yoke of
inauspicious
stars,

it imposes a 'falling intonation'—the voice seems to be going downstairs, and the result is 'ludicrous, hideous, and false.'

O this [logic], what a thing it is!

What careful handling it needs, if the *camouflet* is not to prove more damaging to oneself than to the enemy! The voice does indeed rise toward the end of that line, but it does so *in sympathy with the sense.* The voice does not rise in saying

Thy bones are marrowless, thy blood is cold,

although the so-called 'rising rhythm' of its five iambi is unvaried On the other hand, in saying the line,

Come, sir, we will better it in Pisa,

which is rhythmically as well as metrically trochaic, the voice rises considerably to the final word[1]. But with rare exceptions, in no heroic line but an inferior one do the words fall on the ear with an *unbroken* iambic or an unbroken trochaic rhythm all through, as they do in the following dreadful specimens:

> And then she fell across the bed and swoon'd.
> I treated Belvidera like your daughter. (Otway.)

In a rhythmically good line the feet are broken up, either by a pause or pauses, or by the fact that the words fall into groups some of which have an iambic, others a trochaic rhythm. Thus in the very line quoted by Dr Saintsbury the rhythm, unfortunately for his argument, is not ⏑ – all through; it is this as far as *yoke*, but then the rhythm of the long and important word *inauspicious*, with its trochaic sequences, imposes itself, and these are moreover precisely the syllables which lift the line above the commonplace. The whole contention therefore falls to the ground. But that it should have been made at all, and obviously under the impression that it is sound, is remarkable; for it clearly rests on a confusion of metre with rhythm—a notion that the two are identical, and that when a line is recited, the syllables must be grouped according to the feet of the metrical scheme adopted! That the author actually means this, he has left us no room to doubt; for otherwise there is no point in his taunt of the 'trochaisers,' whom he calls '*rhythm*-deaf,' showing by the terms chosen that he has not realised the distinction that exists between Metric and Rhythmic. Yet the distinction is continually forced upon us by two characteristics of verse which should hardly have escaped the notice of a prosodist. Firstly, that a pause of the voice, even if only the slight pause made after a word to give it emphasis, usually (though not always) gives to the part of the line immediately preceding the pause an iambic rhythm, if the break follows a stressed syllable, and always a trochaic rhythm if it follows an unstressed one. Thus most of our lines end with an iambic rhythm; but if the last foot is completed, the final rhythm is trochaic; and so it is elsewhere in the line. Secondly, the argument takes no account of the fact that when a line is spoken, an attentive ear detects an iambic or trochaic rhythm, as the case may be, in certain individual words or combinations of words even when there is no pause at all, as in the case of *inauspicious* above. Even a disyllable is sufficient to change the rhythm and so redeem a line from monotony, as in the following and thousands of others:

> 'Twas pitiful, 'twas *wondrous* pitiful.

---

[1] The terms 'rising' and 'falling rhythm' are in fact meaningless, and imply what is not true: for whether a word has the quantities – ⏑ or ⏑ –, the pitch of the voice for the second syllable may be either higher or lower than for the first, or it may remain unchanged.

The matter is so important and apparently so little understood, that at the risk of labouring it needlessly, I will draw attention to a few lines from *M. N. D.* by way of further illustration. (The sign || marks here a change of rhythm, and is independent of the single lines occasionally inserted to mark the scansion.)

> The lunatic, || the lover and the poet
> Are of imagination || all compact : ||
> One sees more devils || than | vast | hell can hold, ||
> That is the madman ; the lover, all as frantic,
> Sees Helen's beauty in a brow of Egypt :
> The poet's eye, || in a | fine | frenzy rolling, ||
> Doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven ;
> And as imagination bodies forth
> The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen
> Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy nothing
> A local habitation and a name.

The rhythms here are :—*The lunatic*, iambic, but the rest of the line is trochaic ; the 2nd line begins trochaic and ends with the rhythm of the 'cretic' – ⏑ – in *all compact.* The 3rd, by reason of the slight voice-pause at *devils,* begins trochaic, but it ends iambic. The 4th is altogether trochaic, but is saved by the resolutions and the pauses. So the 5th mainly ; but there is a slight voice-pause at *beauty,* and since there is no stress on *in, in a brow* gives the rhythm ⏑ ⏑ –́,—a delicate touch which, to my ear at least, makes the movement of the line as a whole peculiarly pleasing. In the 6th we have an iambic rhythm in *The poet's eye,* and then a trochaic sequence (to which *in a* becomes a double up-beat), instinctively steadied by the monosyllabic foot *fine.* The 7th is mainly iambic, but ends trochaic ; for I take it that while neither *heaven* is monosyllabic, the *v* and *n* of the second are to be said with very great distinctness, *heav-n.* The 8th is dominated by the trochees of *imagination,* but melts into the 9th, which is iambic, admirably relieved by the irrational *un-* in *unknown.* The 10th is a beautifully diversified line ; metrically it begins with a triplet dactyl but, as recited, with a trochee followed by an iambus. The *and,* though scansionally belonging to the foot *shapes and,* attaches itself to *gives* as though it were the up-beat of a fresh line, so that we go on with an iambus *and gives,* but only to find that the rhythm has imperceptibly melted into a trochaic movement in the two final feet. The last line is markedly trochaic in *local habitation,* but ends with the iambus *a name.*

If, as I more than suspect, the iambic system originally grew out of a confusion of Metric with Rhythmic, being the result of a hasty deduction from the fact that most of our heroic lines begin and end with what is indeed *rhythmically* an iambus, this passage, like countless others, shows that such an appeal to rhythm is futile. Rhythm and Metre have elements in common, but as entities they are distinct. Rhythm in its widest sense denotes *movement in regular succession*, or *a succession of regular movements*; thus the pendulum of a clock and a dancer's feet move in rhythm. As applied to verse, the word usually denotes the movement, the mode of progression, of a line as a whole. This total of movement is made up of units of rhythm, which are of various kinds and lengths. Some are identical with the metrical feet of the measure employed; others are altogether independent of the foot-divisions as (in our triple measures) ⏑ –, ⏑ – ⏑, – ⏑ –, ⏑ ⏑ – (*delight, delightful, discontent, with a cry*) etc. Indeed it is no small part of the poet's art to see that his units of rhythm shall not correspond too frequently with the metrical feet. The units of rhythm must, however, be so adjusted to each other that they can be re-divided into the units of the metre, the 'feet,' each of which, unlike the units of rhythm, must have the *same* time-value; for otherwise metre (measure) vanishes, as it would from a foot-rule divided into uneven spaces. This re-division is the function of scansion, which *takes no account whatever of the word-groupings* on which sense and rhythm so largely depend. Further, the stresses of the metrical units, like those of the rhythm-units, must recur at regular intervals, or they will fail to admit and account for the rhythms of the verse. This is just what our traditional scheme fails to do; it does not measure, because its stresses are irregular and its feet are not equivalents. To look at the matter from the opposite point of view, a poet may take a measure and write to it, introducing units of rhythm quite diverse from those of the measure, and different ones in different lines; but if, when his verse is scanned, his rhythms do not fit the measure perfectly, with the stresses falling as the measure demands, he has written what we call an unmetrical line.

Clearly, then, rhythm is one thing and metre another, and units of rhythm are not to be regarded as metrical 'feet' merely because they happen to occur in the verse. To interpret their presence thus is to miss the point under discussion. We are not now primarily concerned with rhythm. The question at issue is, what is the *metre* (capable of numerous varieties of rhythm, as all but short metres are) which underlies our heroic line? What is the *skeleton* which the poet disguises and transforms when he clothes it with his verse? One of the contentions of this paper—and all Dr Saintsbury's rhetoric leaves it untouched—is that the skeleton jumped together by the prosodists is a badly articulated rickety thing, incapable of the harmonious and rhythmical movements which characterise the living verse of the poets. Ask it to move with grace, or even ease, through any of the lines quoted above under § 7—say, Browning's line,

> He will seem hardly more than a great boy,

and see the poor thing shuffle as it hesitates whether to put down its accenting foot on *He* or *will*—to be wrong whichever it selects, though it must choose one or the other; mark how it misses the indispensable stress on *seem*, and as it hobbles on to the end, after shuffling once more in doubt between *thán a* and *than á*, how it bumps out for us either | *than á* | *great bóy* ||, or (deciding to 'reverse'!) | *thán a* | *great bóy* ||, in either case failing to give *great* the stress it demands. Or if, moving in 'the glory of life,' it starts with an 'anapaest' and the correct stress on *seem*, note that it at once reverses for two turns, and having converted three-fifths of the line into a full dochmiac, ends with the beginning of another. For the paper-scansion

> He will seém | hárdly | móre than | a greát | bóy ∧

produces in spoken effect

> He will ⁝ seém hárdly | móre than || a ⁝ greát bóy ⏑ | – ⏑ [1].

Even and dignified progress is in fact impossible for this iambic-trochaico-anapaestic deformity by reason of its very structure, and there is more truth in Dr Saintsbury's words than perhaps he thought when he indiscreetly compared the 'interchanges' of the passionate trochee with his anapaests and iambs to the '*cross-hands* and *chassez-croisez* and curtseys' of a country-dance—that merry romp of our younger days.

The metrical principles advocated in this paper are equally applicable to lyrics, but that most important branch of the inquiry must be reserved for separate treatment.

M. A. BAYFIELD.

HERTINGFORDBURY, HERTFORD.

---

[1] This *dochmitis* is made to afflict Shakespeare *passim*: e.g. *Hamlet*, 3. 2. 386.

> I will ⁝ spéak dággers | tó her, || but ⁝ úse nóne ⏑ | – ⏑ ||.

ANTOINE DE LA SALE AND THE DOUBTFUL WORKS[1].

II.

The Doubtful Works.

I. *Les Quinze Joyes de Mariage* (date uncertain). Ed. Le Duchat, La Haye, 1726 and 1734, without any name of author; ed. Techener, Paris, 1837; ed. P. Jannet, Paris, 1853, second edition 1857; ed. F. Heuckenkamp, Halle, 1901, a reproduction of the *editio princeps.* For the older editions, see Brunet, *Manuel*, 4, p. 1030 and *Supplément*, 2, p. 359. There are three manuscripts—one (described by A. Pottier, *loc. cit.*, and by P. Jannet, 2nd ed., pp. 11–13) in the library of Rouen. It has been reproduced by F. Heuckenkamp, without any mention of author, printer or date. A second manuscript is at Petrograd (partly reproduced by O. Soelter, *op. cit.*), and a third at Chantilly (reproduced by A. Dressler, *op. cit.*). W. Foerster (*loc. cit.*, col. 404) says he knows of a fourth manuscript, concerning which, however, he vouchsafes no further information[2].

As the title indicates, the *Quinze Joyes de Mariage* consists of fifteen stories, of an average length of about eight pages each, depicting the trials and burdens that befal the man who has allowed himself to be caught in the 'nasse' or net of marriage, from which, like the unhappy fish, he cannot escape, and where he must pass the rest of his days, miserably, as we are reminded in a doleful litany at the end of each of the ironical joys. The *Quinze Joyes de Mariage* is indisputably the most perfect satire against marriage and women that the rich misogynic literature of the Middle Ages presents. Though most of the author's ideas on marriage and women could be paralleled from previous works, both ancient and mediæval, on the same topic, his method of presentation and his artistic execution are so immeasurably superior to those of his predecessors that he may be said truly to maintain complete independence. He no doubt found a good deal of his matter in Theophrastus or Valerius, and borrowed more than one situation from Matheolus and from the *Miroir de Mariage* of Eustache Deschamps; but his incomparable art never fails to give new life to the old worn-out themes. The work is written entirely from the point of view of man, who is represented, in spite of occasional but short-lived revolts, as a kindly and long-suffering creature, while woman, as in the *fabliaux*, is portrayed in the blackest colours, though with infinitely greater art and dramatic power. Despite a too evident partisanship, woman never appears in the *Joyes* as a mere abstraction, as she frequently does in the *fabliaux*, but as a human being, bubbling over with exuberant vitality.

---

[1] Continued from p. 57.

[2] The Chantilly MS. contains the first ten *Joyes* only, the epilogue and the enigma. The eleventh *Joye* has been added in a later hand. It is noteworthy that the Englishman March, in 1662, knows the work by the title of *The Ten Joys of Marriage*; and that Rabelais, in 1550, calls it *Les Neuf Joyes de Mariage* (Bk IV, ch. 23). It may well be that the last five Joys are a later addition, possibly by a different author.

Apart from its intrinsic value the *Quinze Joyes* is equally arresting on account of its stylistic qualities and dramatic liveliness, which shine forth in the crisp and concise dialogue, recalling the easy and natural tone of conversation.

II. *Les Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* (finished 1462). Published anonymously at Cologne, 1701, and also anonymously at the Hague in 1733; ed. Le Roux de Lincy, Paris, 1841; ed. T. Wright, Paris, 1858; ed. P. Lacroix, Paris, 1884. The only manuscript (described by Wright, p. 6 ff. of his Introduction) is in the Hunterian Museum at Glasgow. For early editions cf. Brunet, *Manuel*, I, p. 1732.

The *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* is a collection of a hundred tales represented in a prefatory table as told by various lords and dignitaries of the French and Burgundian courts. In the dedication to Philip of Burgundy (dated 1432, an obvious mistake for 1462) the author, or rather the editor of the collection, declares that his work 'en soy contient et tracte cent histoires assez semblables en matère, sans attaindre le subtil et trèsorné langage du livre de Cent Nouvelles,' by which he means, of course, Boccaccio's *Decameron*, and not the *Cento Novelle antiche*, as one might suppose at first sight. It is clear then that the idea and plan of the work were suggested by the *Decameron*; and in this sense it is true to say that the first French collection of *nouvelles* is due to direct Italian influence. The *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, however, owes very little to the *Decameron*, either in manner or matter; not a single subject can be traced directly to Boccaccio, in spite of certain resemblances in detail. The French author also remains much inferior to his Italian predecessor as a psychologist; the *dramatis personæ* are often mere silhouettes who act according to the exigencies of an intrigue chosen beforehand. In the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* we look in vain for a counterpart to the wronged husbands who exact terrible vengeance for their lost honour, and we miss characters such as the lover Federigo degli Alberighi and his lady, or like Griseldis and many others, drawn with a profound knowledge of human nature beyond the ken of the French author. The latter excels in the anecdotic art as a narrator pure and simple; but he never penetrates very deep into his subject. He has succeeded for the most part in firmly fixing his characters, in giving them relief and the life necessary to develop in a really amusing and dramatic way. In that respect, by throwing on his characters a stronger light from the outside and obtaining more clearly outlined and better prepared situations, he shows an undoubted improvement on his models, though from an artistic point of view he is hardly their equal. Some of the tales may have really taken place at the court of Burgundy; the majority, however, were old subjects localised not only in Italy but in Greece and the East. Odd stories of a serious and moralising character occur, but they are few—not more than half a dozen. Nearly all the stories of this 'glorieux et edifiant euvre,' as it is called, are of the most revolting obscenity, far outstripping the *Decameron*, and more than equalling the other more objectionable Italian *novellieri*. In the collection we see figuring all the classical characters of the *contes à rire*—the necessarily foolish or henpecked husband; the eternal feminine deprived, as in the *fabliaux*, of that halo of glory conferred by the chivalric romances; the artful lover (very often a clerk or a monk), and the terrifyingly capable mother-in-law, who invariably takes the side of her wicked daughter. Thus, whoever may be responsible for the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, he is no great innovator in *gauloiserie*, and we can only approve when a well-known critic terms this collection 'une comédie aux cent actes peu divers.' It is the style which constitutes the extraordinary merit of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*—a style teeming with dramatic life and irrepressible gaiety[1], and reproducing, still more successfully than the *Quinze Joyes*, the characteristics of French as spoken in those days. The author uses dialogue with striking effect, and is likewise fond of proverbial expressions together with images drawn from daily life. Very effective also are the frequent apostrophes addressed to an imaginary circle of listeners, and the extensive use of appropriate euphemisms. By the artistic value of the exposition, by a complete detachment from the prejudices of the Middle Ages, the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* not only marks the real beginning in France of the *nouvelle*, but is at the same time the first great literary manifestation of the Renaissance in that country.

---

[1] Cf. G. Paris, *Esquisse*, p. 251: 'Insignifiantes par le fond, les *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* se sauvent par la forme: on peut leur reprocher, outre la trop complaisante crudité des détails, une prolixité qui va souvent jusqu'à la redondance; mais la langue, sauf ce défaut, en est excellente, savoureuse, plantureuse, et relevée çà et là de grâce et de finesse. C'est une reproduction singulièrement habile, sous l'apparente négligence, de la langue alors parlée.'

As Antoine de la Sale's fame rests to a large extent on these two disputed works, each of which has come down to us without the author's name, it is essential to examine with scrupulous care the question of the authorship of the *Quinze Joyes de Mariage* and of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*. The *Quinze Joyes* was first attributed to Antoine de la Sale by Pottier (*loc. cit.*, 1830), and the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* by Le Roux de Lincy, in his edition of that work (1841). Their view was accepted by practically all critics for many years[1], in spite of a few isolated dissenting voices which passed unheeded, such as that of C. Magnin as early as 1856, and of Joseph Nève in 1881. Nève particularly combated with telling arguments the ascription to de la Sale of the *Quinze Joyes*, as well as of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, but his important work, published for private circulation, shared the fate of such publications; and it was only when he elaborated his arguments, twenty-two years later, that the hitherto generally accepted belief in Antoine de la Sale's authorship was seriously shaken, and that a considerable controversy arose, and is still being waged, round the subject. Several critics, however, in spite of Nève's powerful evidence, have remained unconvinced. Others refuse to give judgment one way or the other (Söderhjelm, Doutrepont); while a few (such as G. Raynaud), after believing in Antoine de la Sale's authorship of the two works, are now convinced that he could not possibly have written the *Quinze Joyes*. A third group, represented by Nève, Langlois, Foerster and some others, refuse to see in Antoine de la Sale the author of either work, We share their view; and the object of the present inquiry is to justify that belief. Before proceeding further, one point, which has been strangely overlooked, may be cleared up, namely, that Antoine de la Sale cannot be the author of *both* the disputed works. If he were, he would not have quoted his own work (*Les Quinze Joyes de Mariage*) in the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* among the 'histoires anciennes' which form part of the library of the jealous man, together with Matheolet (i.e. a work of the late thirteenth century, or if, as is probable, the French translation is alluded to, of the late fourteenth century) and Juvenal, in the thirty-seventh story of that collection[1].

---

[1] Guichart (1843), Jannet (1853, 1857), Wright (1857), Stern (1870), Gossart (1871), Picot (1887), G. Paris (1895, 1896, 1897), Petit de Julleville (1896), Suchier (1900), Jeanroy (1901), Grojean (1904)—all share the view that Antoine de la Sale is the author of both the *Quinze Joyes* and the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*. Petit de Julleville has some doubts about the *Quinze Joyes*, but still to him Antoine de la Sale is the probable author.

I.

(1) The chief argument in favour of de la Sale's authorship of *Les Quinze Joyes de Mariage* is Pottier's proposed deciphering of a certain enigma found at the end of the Rouen manuscript (1464), and also, with a few slightly different readings, at the end of the Chantilly manuscript (1480), to the following effect:

De labelle la teſte ouſtez
Treſ uiſtement dauant le monde
Et ſamere decapitez
Tantoſt et apres le ſeconde
Toutes trois a meſſe vendront.
Sans teſte bien chantee et dicte.
Le monde auec elles tendront
Sur deux piedz qui le tout acquite.

The enigma is immediately followed by these words: 'En ces huyt lignes trouuerez le nom de celui qui a dictes Les .XV. joies de mariage au plaiſir et a la louenge des mariez. Eſquelles ilz sont bien aiſes. Dieu les y veille continuer.'

By decapitating the words '*labelle*,' '*samere*' and '*lesconde*,' Pottier obtained *La Sale*; and his explanation was supported by de la Sale's known fondness for punning on his name. Other explanations of the riddle were proposed by Lacroix and others, but Pottier's held the field as being obviously seductive. The objections to it, however, are manifest; the most serious is that the last four lines of the charade are unexplained; and secondly that no account is taken of the essential words ('*belle*,' '*mère*,' '*seconde*') in the first four verses, for which, according to the method adopted by Pottier, other words could be substituted without modifying the interpretation, as Nève aptly remarks. Génin attempted to remove the first objection by the discovery, as he thought, of the word '*semond*,' to which he gave the meaning '*enseigne*,' in the concluding part of the riddle, so that according to him the solution would read: '*La Sale semond = La Sale enseigne*.' But here again telling objections are not difficult to find; *semond* can hardly mean

---

[1] The passage in question runs as follows: 'Et car, la Dieu mercy, les histoires anciennes, comme Matheolet, Juvenal, les Quinze Joyes de Mariage, et aultres pluseurs dont je ne scay le compte, font mencion de diverses tromperies, cauteles, abusions et deceptions en cest estat advenues.'

'*enseigne*'; and moreover Antoine de la Sale's motto was not the one made up by Génin, but '*Il conuient. De là Sale,*' as we know from what he tells us in his *Salade*, and from a certain book, preserved in the library of Carpentras, which has come down to us with his signature and motto. (Labande, *loc. cit.*, p. 391.) In 1903, an anonymous writer came forward with a new solution. After proving in the first part of his pamphlet, to his own satisfaction, three things—that the author must have been a monk; that he must have hailed from Picardy, and that he must have written his work between 1368 and 1380 (two of them very doubtful propositions), he proposes to solve the problem as follows:

(Labe) le samer(e)·(lesecond)e Pierre.

According to him this is to be interpreted as:

L'abbé [*de*] *Samer, Pierre II.*

Then he looks up the *Gallia Christiana*, and finds there, in the list of Abbots of the Benedictine monastery of Samer near Boulogne, in Picardy, the name of one '*Petrus II, 25 febr. 1377, 6 jul. et 8 sept. 1378, ex chartis authenticis D de Gaignieres*'—and for him the sphinx has given up his secret, and the author of the *Quinze Joyes* stands revealed in the person of the Abbot Peter, the second of that name, of the monastery of Samer. However plausible this explanation may appear at first sight, the conviction gradually gains ground in one's mind that the deciphering has been made to agree with a preconceived idea. It would be tedious to enumerate all the objections that might be raised. First of all there is the enigmatic Pierre, fetched from the *Roman de la Rose*, where he is identified with the Pope, who, according to the anonymous author, must be the person with a Christian name of two syllables who, as the riddle says, holds the world in his hand. Secondly, in the words '*labelle,*' '*samere*' and '*leseconde,*' not the head, according to the riddle, but the tail is cut off; and moreover, supposing that these syllables designate an abbot of Samer, it is unreasonable to say that this abbot comes to mass without his head; and if one replies that it is not the abbot in person who goes there, but the words which designate him, the thing is still more absurd, for after the operation which they have just undergone, it is their heads alone which go to mass. Then again the word '*de*' is arbitrarily supplied, and the whole enigma, such as the anonymous author proposes to solve it, should read, according to his own instructions, not

L'abbé [*de*] *Samer, Pierre II,*

but:

L'abbé Samer le second Pierre—

which is nonsense. Further, we are told to look—this is the usual process in such *engiens*—for the '*nom*' of the author of the *Quinze Joyes* and not for his family name, or *surnom*, as they said in those days. And lastly, even if some new Œdipus succeeds in finding the name hidden in the riddle, it will be no proof that we know the name of the author of the *Quinze Joyes.* Rather, the doggerel verses of the logogriph are so bad, that it is hard to believe they emanate from the author of the *Quinze Joyes.*

(2) At this point it becomes necessary to consider the question of the probable date of the *Quinze Joyes*, on which so much depends. The first to attribute a definite date to that work appears to be La Monnoye (vol. I, p. 108 of his *Menagiana*). He there assigns to it the date 1450, on no evidence. Le Duchat in his edition of the *Quinze Joyes* (1726), after having stated in his 'avertissement' that the work had appeared 'vers le milieu du xv^e^ siècle,' takes a different view in his annotations to that edition; he now proposes to identify 'La bataille de Flandres' (*Joye IV*) with the fight at Rosebecque, which took place in 1382, and concludes that the *Quinze Joyes* must have been composed soon after the battle of Agincourt (1415) at a time, as *Joye VII* insinuates, when the French were prone to allow themselves to be made prisoners by the English. In a subsequent note he adds that the *Quinze Joyes* should be referred approximately to the year 1420 or 1430, and not to 1450, as La Monnoye declared. But Le Duchat's arguments have little or no value; there is no tittle of proof that the battle of Rosebecque is intended, and the allusions to the English are too vague to have any chronological weight. The date (1450) put forward by La Monnoye was not shaken by Le Duchat's arguments. It appears to have been universally accepted without further reflection, and prevailed till quite recently. The view that the *Quinze Joyes* is much older than La Monnoye imagined is enforced by the fact, already mentioned, that the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, completed in 1462, quotes the *Quinze Joyes* among 'Les histoires anciennes' which treat of the wiles practised by women against their husbands, alongside Matheolet, i.e. the French translation, by Jean Lefèvre of Ressons, of the Latin *Liber lamentationum Matheoluli* of the clerk Mathieu or Mahieu (end of the thirteenth century)[1]. Now as the French translation of Matheolus belongs to the year 1371 or 1372 (Van Hamel, *op. cit.*, II, p. clxxxii) and it is coupled in the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* with the *Quinze Joyes*, it is obvious that the *Quinze Joyes*

---

[1] Cf. A. G. Van Hamel, *Les Lamentations de Matheolus et le Livre de Leesce de Jehan le Fèvre de Ressons*, Paris, 1905.

is much older than the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* (1456—1462), and reasonable to believe that it is approximately of the same age as Le Fèvre's translation of Matheolus, though to apply the term 'ancient' to a composition relatively so recent, or to link it with Juvenal, as is done in the same story of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, might be held to weaken somewhat the force of the argument, which, despite all, seems to us conclusive, the more so that it is corroborated by a passage in *Joye I* referring to contemporary women's dress, which appears also to point to the end of the fourteenth or, at the latest, to the beginning of the fifteenth century[1]. Additional support for that date, if we are to believe the anonymous author of *Une Énigme d'Histoire Littéraire*[2], is to be found in the appellation '*Viennois*' as applied to the Dauphin (*Joye V* and *Joye VIII*). According to him, the designation '*Viennois*' in speaking of the heir-apparent was confined to the fourteenth century, and the plain title *Dauphin*, instead of the earlier *Dauphin viennois*, came into use only in the fifteenth century. Unfortunately for this contention, it can be shown that the fuller designation occurs much later than the fourteenth century; for example, the heir-apparent is styled '*daulphin de Viennois*' or '*dolphin de Vyenne*' in two manuscripts dealing with the murder of Jean sans Peur at the bridge of Montereau, 1419. Neither of the manuscripts[3] is dated, but as the murder at Montereau took place on September 10th, 1419, they must naturally have been written after that date, and therefore well in the fifteenth century. We also come across the title '*Delphinus Viennensis*' much later in the official report dated May 24th, 1444, of the celebration of the betrothal of Henry VI of England and Margaret of Anjou[4]. In spite of this there is a strong probability, amounting almost to certainty, that the *Quinze Joyes* must be referred to the end of the fourteenth, and at all events not advanced further than the very beginning of the fifteenth century, which is equivalent to saying that, whichever of the two alternatives we accept, Antoine de la Sale is excluded as the author of the *Quinze Joyes de Mariage*, even if, following Labande, the year of his birth is assigned to the earliest possible date (1386). This conclusion, it is true, is not endorsed by Shepard's study of the syntax, or rather of the morphology, of *Saintré*, *Les Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* and *Les Quinze Joyes de Mariage*. After a comparison of the three works from that point of view, he is led to the conclusion that *Saintré* (1456) is of older date than the *Quinze Joyes*. But Shepard, who bases his conclusions on Jannet's edition of the *Quinze Joyes*, itself based on the Rouen manuscript of 1464, has overlooked the fact that the Rouen manuscript, as well as those of Chantilly and of Petrograd, are copies of a lost original, which we may conclude, from the evidence we have advanced, is of much earlier date than the copies. Syntactic and particularly morphological evidence (the same applies to dialectal evidence), drawn from the manuscripts of the *Quinze Joyes* that are extant, can have little weight, and is in no case decisive[1].

---

[1] The passage in question runs as follows: 'Par ma foy, fait-elle, il n'y avoit si petite de l'estat dont je suis qui n'eust robe d'écarlate ou de Malignes, ou de fin vert, fourée de bon gris ou de menu-ver, à grands manches, et chaperon à l'avenant, à grant cruche, avecques un tessu de soye rouge ou vert, traynent jusques à terre, et tout fait à la nouvelle guise.'

[2] Söderhjelm, *La Nouvelle Française au xv^e siècle*, pp. 30, 31, appears inclined to share that view.

[3] Cf. Doutrepont, *op. cit.*, 1909, p. 433.

[4] Cf. Lecoy de la Marche, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 256.

(3) But there are still stronger grounds for rejecting the ascription of the *Quinze Joyes* to Antoine de la Sale. In the Prologue to the work occurs the following passage, in which the author, alluding to the fifteen Joys of the Holy Virgin, says: 'moy aussi, pensant et considerant le fait de mariage, où je ne fus oncques, pour ce qu'il a pleu à Dieu me mettre en autre servage, hors de franchise que je ne puis plus recouvrer, ay advisé que en mariage a quinze seremonies, selon ce que j'en puis faire par l'avoir veu et ouy dire à ceulx qui bien le savoient, lesquelles ceulx qui sont mariés tiennent à joyes, plaisances et felicités.' These words show beyond a shadow of doubt that the author was not married. But it is proved by documentary evidence, as we have shown in the first part of this paper, that Antoine de la Sale was a married man, his marriage having taken place about 1436, or at the latest for certain in the year 1439. It also looks from this passage as if the author meant to indicate that he was in the service of the church and in a bondage ('*servage*'), out of which there was no freedom ('*franchise*'), whereas Antoine de la Sale was a layman. Raynaud (*Romania*, XXXIII, p. 107) objects that the word '*servage*' opposed to '*franchise*' could not in the Middle Ages be used in speaking of monastic vows. According to him '*servage*' is to be interpreted as '*servage d'amour*,' what is called nowadays a *chaîne* or *liaison*. This might be a valid argument if we made of the author a monk, as Nève and others have done, but we see no necessity for doing so, or rather reply that the tone of the whole book and certain

---

[1] Though the copies of the *Quinze Joyes* that have come down to us are much younger than the original, they may be shown to contain traces of a much older usage, such for example as the pronoun *ly* for *lui*, and of constructions like '*dont il fist que foul*' (ed. Jannet², p. 24). This explains why Stern (*loc. cit.* p. 118) and the author of *Une Énigme d'Histoire Littéraire* (p. 34), speak of 'archaisms' and the archaic character of the language of the *Quinze Joyes*.

indications[1] show that the author was not cloistered. Moreover, if the author was bound by a *liaison* only, he would not describe himself as in a 'bondage' from which there was no recovery. The probability then is that he was an ecclesiastic of some sort, though not a monk. We are further told in the Prologue, or at least we gather from the words quoted, that the author collected the information for his pitiless and penetrating satire from hearsay and observation. This is difficult to believe, however well read he may have been in the rich misogynic literature of Antiquity and of the Middle Ages; or even if we admit (an admission hardly justifiable in the light of the passage quoted from the seventh *Joye*) that he obtained hints from avowals made at the confessional. The same dilemma has presented itself to those who suppose that Antoine de la Sale is the author; G. Paris, for example, asks pertinently, without however being able to supply an answer: 'où ce voyageur, ce lettré, ce familiar des princes, avait-il appris à connaître par le menu, la vie bourgeoise, telle qu'il la peint avec une si consciencieuse et si amusante minutie, dans ces quinze petits tableaux d'intérieur[2]?' The anonymous writer of *Une Énigme d'Histoire Littéraire* gives an explanation which, though ingenious, fails to carry conviction: 'On comprend,' he says, 'pourquoi se trouvant lui-même "en servage," comme il le dit, l'auteur a tenté de trouver dans la vie séculière—et peut-être pour se consoler—*l'exemple d'un servage qu'il pensait comparable.* Toute l'explication du livre est là.' Stern (*op. cit.*, p. 124), who insists with quite touching credulity that Antoine de la Sale must be the author of the *Quinze Joyes*, tries to get over the difficulty by saying that the expression '*franchise que je ne puis plus recouvrer*' probably refers to Antoine de la Sale's 'dependence' on the house of Anjou. It is sufficient to reply that de la Sale was never in any 'bondage,' and that he was at liberty to leave the service of René of Anjou at any time, as he did indeed in 1448 to go over to that of Louis de Luxembourg.

Two facts then stand out undisputed, namely, that the author of the *Quinze Joyes* was sworn or condemned to permanent celibacy, and that on the contrary Antoine de la Sale was a married man. The contradiction is irreconcilable and decisive. Even if, leaving out of account for the moment all other considerations, it be granted that Antoine de la Sale could have written the *Quinze Joyes* at some period *before* his marriage, it would be necessary to show that he was ever in a 'bondage' from which no escape was possible.

---

[1] The following passage, for example, from the seventh *Joye*: 'Si avient souvent que la femme qui ainsi se gouverne, gaste tout et met tout à perte par son mauvais gouvernement, et follement baille les biens que le pauvre mari acquiert à grant travail, selon l'estat dont il est, et les despent en moult de manières, tant à son ami que à vieilles maquerelles, que à son confesseur, qui est ung cordelier ou ung jacopin, qui a une grosse pension d'elle pour la absoubdre chacun an; car telles gens ont volontiers le povoir du pape.'

[2] *La Poésie Française du Moyen Age*, 1895, IIe série, p. 253.

(4) The strongest argument in favour of Antoine de la Sale's authorship of the *Quinze Joyes* was thought for a long time to reside in Gossart's discovery, made in 1871 and repeated by him thirty years after, that a passage inspired by Saint Jerome's epistle *Adversus Jovinianum*[1], which occurs in la Sale's work entitled *La Sale*, bears a striking resemblance to certain passages in the *Quinze Joyes*. 'Ne dirait-on pas,' exclaims Gossart triumphantly, 'que la Sale, en écrivant ce chapitre, rassemblait les éléments des *Quinze Joyes?* Ce sont des deux côtés, les mêmes idées, le même style, le même esprit.' These words show that Gossart was under the impression that the *Quinze Joyes* was written at a later date than *La Sale* (1451), which, as we have just seen, is an untenable proposition. However the admission that the passage in *La Sale* referred to is based on the *Quinze Joyes* and not *vice versa*, as Gossart concludes, is not necessary; the case falls to the ground just the same, for if we put forward the date of the composition of the *Quinze Joyes*, against all probability, to the extreme limit (say 1410–15) and assume that Antoine de la Sale's literary career began at an early date, as indeed we are authorised to do by a certain statement already quoted in the prologue to Rasse de Brunhamel's romance of *Floridam et Eluide*, this would allow a period of between thirty-five to forty years to elapse before the composition of *La Sale*. As the alleged imitation in *La Sale* of the *Quinze Joyes* is far inferior from all points of view to the original, it is impossible to believe that Antoine, imitating himself after so long an interval and when his style had reached greater maturity, would have done so in such a colourless fashion. It would be equally unreasonable to suppose that with time his style had lost its freshness, seeing that it is nowhere so alert as in *Saintré*, written a few years only after *La Sale*. Gossart's contention is also invalidated by various other considerations. It is legitimate to assume that Antoine de la Sale had read the *Quinze Joyes*; in which case *La Sale* would contain an echo only of the *Quinze Joyes* and not the germ of that work. Moreover, it is well known that the epistle of Saint Jerome, as well as Valerius, one of la Sale's favourite authors, was a common source from which all those in the Middle Ages who wrote against marriage did not hesitate to draw freely. Further, Antoine de la Sale's attack on marriage in *La Sale*, borrowed from Saint Jerome, is an isolated attack;

---

[1] Cf. Migne, *Patrologie latine*, XXIII, col. 222 et seq.

anxious to 'repaisier les pensifs cuers des dames,' he follows it up by the most touching examples of conjugal love, and concludes with a statement which leaves no doubt as to his intentions: 'et cy donray fin a mon IX et derrain chappitre des femmes que jadis heurent à leurs marys; car qui les vouldroit tout escripre, tres longue serait lesquelz j'ay mis à l'opposite des philosophes et de tous ceulx qui dient le contraire.' Such words recall in no way the pitiless author of the *Quinze Joyes.* But all these arguments against Gossart's conclusion are rendered unnecessary by Lecourt's recent discovery, which is absolutely overwhelming, to the effect that nine-tenths of *La Sale,* including the paraphrase of Saint Jerome's epistle, is lifted straight from the pages of Simon de Hesdin's translation of the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* of Valerius Maximus, and the copious commentary added thereto by the French translator. Lecourt's find destroys once for all what had hitherto been held by some scholars to be a weighty argument, and disposes of a similar argument advanced almost simultaneously by Stern (*op. cit.* p. 123), who, though unacquainted with *La Sale,* had also been struck by certain resemblances between Saint Jerome's *Adversus Jovinianum* and *Saintré* as well as the *Quinze Joyes.*

(5) Several critics who are in favour of the ascription of the *Quinze Joyes* to de la Sale put forward the contention, apparently first launched by Le Duchat, who imagined he saw Picard words and turns on every page, that the influence of the Picard dialect can be traced in the *Quinze Joyes.* They argue that this alleged presence of Picard peculiarities corroborates the rest of the evidence in support of Antoine de la Sale's claim, as he is known to have passed a large part of his life in that province. Apart from the fact that de la Sale did not settle in the North till 1448, when he entered the service of Louis de Luxembourg, and that, allowing for every latitude, that date does not tally with the date of the composition of the *Quinze Joyes,* no shred of evidence (and for very good reasons) has ever been brought forward to back that allegation. There is no trace of Picard peculiarities in the manuscripts or in the *editio princeps*[1]; the few tracts that might be gleaned from later editions, seeing that we have to deal with a prose work, do not go to prove that the author was a Picard, but only that the copyist came from those parts. As for the allusions to certain towns of the North (Malines, Thérouanne), they are all very natural and explain themselves otherwise than by

---

[1] A few forms in *ou* instead of *o* (*chouse* for *chose*, etc.) might be put down as Picard. Such forms in the sixteenth century are characteristic of the Parisian dialect; they may have found their way into the Parisian dialect as early as the fourteenth or beginning of the fifteenth century, when the *Quinze Joyes* was written.

reminiscences of his home on the part of the author. The same applies to the proverb in which figures 'Martin de Cambrai' (*Joye XI*): a proverb current throughout France, and to be found in Rabelais for example, who came from Touraine. We might just as well argue, as does indeed Stern, that the *Quinze Joyes* was written in Provence at the court of René, because mention is made in the eighth *Joye* of a pilgrimage to Notre Dame of Rocamadour in Quercy.

Lastly, the following facts, which militate likewise against de la Sale's authorship, may be put forward:

(6) All Antoine de la Sale's authentic works are signed in no unambiguous way, and frequently dated, whereas the *Quinze Joyes* is anonymous, and undated.

(7) There is no copy of the *Quinze Joyes* in the collection of the Dukes of Burgundy, in which all de la Sale's authentic works are represented, save the unimportant *Des Anciens Tournois.*

To sum up we may say that the author of the *Quinze Joyes de Mariage,* about whom we know absolutely nothing, but who was probably an ecclesiastic, wrote his work at the end of the fourteenth, or at the latest, at the beginning of the fifteenth century, soon after Le Fèvre's translation of Matheolus[1], which by popularising Mathieu's earlier and neglected *Liber Lamentationum,* turned men's minds afresh to a topic of perennial interest[2].

II.

Leaving aside for the moment the consideration of the style and spirit which animate the two disputed works, let us next examine on what grounds Antoine de la Sale is alleged to be the author or rather the editor of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles.* Before the work itself, there is a list of about forty noblemen and officers of Burgundy and France who are mentioned as responsible for these stories. The dedication dated Dijon 1462, and addressed to Philippe le Bon of Burgundy, shows clearly three things—that there was only one author, or rather *rédacteur*;

---

[1] For the sake of completeness it may be mentioned that Lecourt (*loc. cit.* p. 351) has thrown out the suggestion that the author of the *Quinze Joyes* may be Simon de Hesdin, who was an ecclesiastic be it remembered, and who never misses a chance of abusing women. However, this tempting way out of the difficulty presents many obstacles.

[2] Cf. Van Hamel, *op. cit.* II, p. clvii: 'C'est uniquement dans cette traduction qu'on lira désormais l'œuvre du bigame, c'est exclusivement d'après sa forme française qu'elle sera lue et discutée...dans le monde des clercs comme dans celui des femmes et de leurs champions pendant tout le XV^e^ siècle et dans la première moitié du XVI^e^ siècle.'

that he was answerable for editing and arranging the collection in a literary form; and that he did so at Philip's request: 'Je, vostre tresobeissant serviteur, desirant, comme je dois, complaire à toutes vos treshaultes et tresnobles intencions en facon à moy possible, ose et presume ce present petit oeuvre, à vostre requeste et advertissement mis en terme et sur piez, vous presenter et offrir.' Of these stories fourteen are attributed to 'Monseigneur' and one is ascribed by name to 'Monseigneur de la Sale,' namely number 50. For a long time, and this opinion is still found expressed in serious works (by Toldo, for example, and Littré in his Dictionary), the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* was attributed to the Dauphin, subsequently Louis XI of France (who, as is well known, had a weakness for doubtful stories), chiefly because it was thought that the designation 'Monseigneur' must apply to him. This designation, however, can only apply to Philippe le Bon, as is definitely shown by an article in the inventory of 1467, which, describing the manuscript of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* in the collection of the Dukes of Burgundy, states that the various stories are 'tant de Monseigneur, que Dieu pardonne, que de plusieurs autres de son hostel.' This is evidently a reference to Philippe le Bon of Burgundy, recently deceased. Besides, several of the conteurs are mentioned with the indication of the functions they occupied in the household of 'Monseigneur' or 'Monseigneur le Duc,' such for example as Antoine de la Sale himself. Among the conteurs, apart from Philip and de la Sale, the best known are Philippe Pot, Seigneur de la Roche, with the largest number of stories to his account—fifteen; Jean de Crequy and Philippe de Croy, both literary men of the period; Louis de Luxembourg, Comte de Saint-Pol, Antoine de la Sale's master and patron; Guillaume de Monbléru, nephew of the poet Jean Regnier; and the chronicler and bibliophile Jean de Wavrin. Most of the scenes, as we are reminded in the dedication, are set in the north of France or in what is now Belgium, in the territories of the Dukes of Burgundy.

The arguments for and against de la Sale's authorship, or rather editorship, may be presented as follows:

(1) From the fact that Antoine de la Sale is mentioned by name as the author of the fiftieth Nouvelle, and that there can be only one 'acteur,' as the unity of style throughout the collection as well as the language of the dedication proves, it is maintained that the 'acteur' can be none other than Antoine de la Sale, on the ground that of all the writers who are known to have been at or about Philip's court (1456–1461) he is the only one whose talent was equal to editing the

collection. Both Wright (p. XIII and XIX) and Nève (*op. cit.* 1903, pp. 91–2) think there is every reason to believe that the attribution of each story to the narrator who is mentioned as the author, is purely imaginary—a polite fiction, invented by the 'acteur' to please his patron and his friends. If so, the name of de la Sale at the head of the fiftieth story would not have any special significance; he would have been included in the same way as any other official connected with the court of Burgundy at the time. However, the title of the collection in the inventory of 1467: 'Ung livre......contenant Cent Nouvelles, tant de Monseigneur, que Dieu pardonne, que de plusieurs autres de son hostel,' appears to indicate that the work is the result of a multiple collaboration. The opening of certain of the nouvelles, too, goes to show that the conteur is not fictitious. Thus the fifty-seventh Nouvelle, put down to Monseigneur de Villiers, is introduced by these words: 'Tantdiz que l'on me preste audience et que ame ne s'avance quand à present de parfournir ceste glorieuse et edifiant euvre de cent nouvelles, je vous compteray ung cas qui puis n'aguères est advenu ou Daulphiné, pour estre mis ou reng et nombre des dictes nouvelles'; or again the ninetieth Nouvelle by Monseigneur de Beaumont begins as follows: 'Pour accroistre et amplier mon nombre des nouvelles que j'ai promis compter et descripre, j'en monstreray cy une dont la venue est fresche.' Further, if the attribution of the stories to the several narrators is purely imaginary and corresponds in no way to reality, how are we to explain the fact that the distribution of the nouvelles is so arbitrary; that while a certain member of the court is credited with as many as fourteen stories, several have only one to their account? Thus it would appear that the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* represents a real scene from life; that it should be regarded as a collection of Table Talks and other stories current at Philip's court. In that case, Antoine must be accepted as the author of the fiftieth tale, though the ascription to him of that story does not on the face of it prove that he was the author or rather the editor of the whole collection. This claim is made, as we have seen, on the ground that he alone of the writers attached to the Burgundian court at the time was equal to the task of editing the collection. This, however, is a doubtful proposition. We have only to think of Georges Chastellain, the star among the chroniclers in the service of Philippe le Bon and Charles le Téméraire, and a really important writer, not to speak of Olivier de la Marche. Another name which occurs to one's mind is Jehan, bastard of Wavrin (he figures among the conteurs), the author of the *Recueil des Chroniques et an-*

chiennes Histoires de la Grande Bretaigne (begun in 1445), which assures him a notable rank among the historiographers of the fifteenth century. In addition, the fiftieth tale is admittedly one of the worst as well as one of the coarsest of the whole collection. How are we to account for the fact that Antoine de la Sale, supposing that he is the editor, chose it for the purpose of declaring himself? The true answer to the question appears to us to have been given by C. Magnin; referring to the fiftieth tale he writes: 'cette déplaisante histoire qu'il a signée suivant son usage est une des plus choquantes pour le fond, et des moins agréables par la forme, qui soient dans tout le recueil. On sent dans ce court récit, la gêne d'un écrivain dépaysé. On ne comprend pas, je le répète, que, sur un aussi maussade échantillon, la pensée soit venu à quelques critiques d'attribuer à La Sale la rédaction de tout le livre.' We feel no difficulty in imagining Antoine de la Sale reluctantly making his contribution to a common enterprise which had his master's approval; as one of the officers of the Burgundian court he could hardly stand completely aloof.

(2) The romance of *Floridam et Eluide* which had been dictated to Antoine de la Sale by the author, Rasse de Brunhamel, is reproduced (this was first pointed out by Stern) with some modifications in the ninetieth story of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, where, it must be owned, its tragic note is not in keeping with the general tone of the collection. But why, it may be asked in reply, should not another have borrowed it, the more so as it was a well-known story of relatively recent occurrence[1], which could be read in a slightly altered form in the *Novellino* of Masuccio, one of the most popular contemporary Italian *novellieri*[2]? It is also noteworthy that in the version of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* the two lovers are not designated by the romantic names of Floridam et Eluide.

(3) Twenty-one of the tales (Küchler, *op. cit.*, p. 67), including the fiftieth, are derived from Poggio's *Facetiae*. According to Petit de Julleville[3], supported by Gröber (*loc. cit.*, p. 1151) and Grojean (*loc. cit.*, p. 79), Antoine de la Sale had made the acquaintance of Poggio at the time of his sojourn at Rome in 1422. This assertion, however, rests on no evidence of any kind. Poggio did not return to Rome from England

---

[1] In the prologue addressed by Rasse de Brunhamel to Antoine de la Sale, the former speaks of the story of *Floridam et Eluide* as 'une chose nouvelle faicte n'a guaires par aduenture piteuse' (MS. nouv. acq. fr. B. N. 10057, f°. 179, r°).

[2] See Landau, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der italienischen Novelle*, Wien, 1875, p. 64, and G. Paris, *Journal des Savants*, 1875, p. 16.

[3] *Revue des Cours et Conférences*, Dec. 19, 1895, p. 217.

till the autumn of 1423, when de la Sale in all probability left the Holy City for Naples in the train of Louis of Anjou. Grojean, in his endeavour to evade awkward dates, affirms that de la Sale made more than one stay in Rome, but of this again we have no proof whatsoever. Probabilities point the other way. It is of course possible, though hardly relevant, that a copy of the *Facetiae*, which were not published till 1450 but circulated in manuscript much before that date, may have come into Antoine de la Sale's hands, or that he may have heard some of the stories of the 'Chamber of Lies,' during one of his numerous visits to Italy.

(4) Wright (*op. cit.*, p. XIV) noticed that the tale (no. 50) attributed to Antoine de la Sale, and those attributed to the 'acteur' (nos. 51, 91, 92, 98 and 99), are presented in groups of two; and he is disposed to believe that this grouping is not fortuitous: 'La nouvelle cinquante est attribuée à Monseigneur de la Sale, et la cinquante-et-unième porte le nom de "l'acteur" (l'auteur). Comme ses autres Nouvelles se présentent ensemble deux à deux il me paroît assez vraisemblable que l'auteur a voulu faire la même disposition ici, et qu'ayant mis son nom à la première, il s'est contenté de se désigner modestement dans les autres par le seul titre de "l'auteur."' This is certainly a curious coincidence, and Wright's explanation is ingenious, though hardly sufficiently weighty to affect the balance appreciably.

(5) G. Paris (*loc. cit.*, 1896), and Grojean after him (*loc. cit.*, p. 181), recall the fact that the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* makes mention in eulogistic terms of 'la bonne et doulce comté de Saint-Pol' (ed. Wright, II, p. 114), and of 'comte Wallerant en son temps comte de Saint-Pol et appelé le beau comte' (*ibid.*, I, p. 128); that Louis de Luxembourg, Antoine's protector, figures among the conteurs (39th story), as does also Antoine de Villers, who is probably to be identified with the Antoine de Villiers at whose wedding Antoine de la Sale tells us he was present[1]. These places and persons, however, being local, are such as would naturally occur to any writer connected with the Burgundian court.

The following additional reasons may be adduced against Antoine's authorship of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*.

(6) There is no proof that de la Sale was alive in 1462 when the collection of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* was completed and presented to Philippe de Bourgogne.

(7) Even if de la Sale were still alive in 1462, he would then have

---

[1] See *Des Anciens Tournois et Faictz d'Armes*, ed. Prost, p. 204.

been an old man of 74 at least, and possibly of 76. It is hard to believe, while making due allowance for contemporary manners, that a man of that age would take pleasure in compiling a collection of obscene stories, especially as the works that are indubitably his do not contain a single word to which the most fastidious reader could take exception. It is no more probable that one so advanced in years possessed the strength and powers required to edit and produce so considerable a work; three years previously we see de la Sale alluding to himself as 'viel et non savant' in excuse for the deficiencies of his *Des Anciens Tournois* (1459). At that time his whole mood, which towards the end of his life is tinged with melancholy, was not such as to suggest to him such topics.

(8) Not any more than in the *Quinze Joyes*, supposing him to be the editor of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, has he given any clue to his identity, though his authentic works are unmistakeably signed. It is no answer to say that as the total invention was not his, he was unwilling to attribute the collection to himself only.

(9) To these objections Söderhjelm[1] adds a further one, which appears to him more important than any of the others: 'La Sale est sans doute plus artiste, plus psychologue, plus fin que l'auteur des *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles.* On pourrait répondre qu'il n'a pas montré ici cette face de son talent aussi peu que dans plusieurs autres de ses ouvrages. C'est possible, quoique peu probable, car il l'aurait montrée malgré lui. Et, pour vrai dire, je ne retrouve nulle part, ni dans les anecdotes burlesques, ni dans les histoires moralisantes, le ton même et la note intime de l'auteur du *Petit Jehan de Saintré* et du *Réconfort.*'

Much discussion has taken place as to whether Antoine de la Sale, measured by his authentic works, was capable of rising to the height necessary for the composition of the *Quinze Joyes* and the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*; and whether the spirit and tone of these two works is not such as to exclude the possibility of his authorship. Nève (*op. cit.* p. 194 ff.) declares that in his five authentic works de la Sale is a typical man of the Middle Ages, unaffected by his travels in Italy, untouched by scepticism, an aristocrat upholding tradition, an altruist, despite the shadow of melancholy which beclouds his later years. On the other hand, the spirit which animates the *Quinze Joyes,* as also the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles,* is 'sensuel, sceptique, bourgeois et ricaneur.' To attempt to reconcile this incompatibility, so clearly visible, by endowing de la Sale for the purpose with a double and contradictory nature, says

---

[1] *La Nouvelle Française au* xv^{e} *siècle*, p. 158.

Nève, is simply begging the question. He follows up the attack by asserting that de la Sale is not a caustic writer; that his style in the authentic works is neither incisive nor alert, whereas the two disputed works, 'écrites d'une plume vive et mordante, font éclater à chaque ligne une verve impitoyable, un incorrigible scepticisme. Le rire y triomphe, de l'un à l'autre bout, discret et contenu, mais ironique et profond dans les *Quinze Joyes,* bruyant et rabelaisien dans les *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles.*' No more striking contrast, he exclaims, could be imagined. The opposite view, held by G. Paris[1] and other critics of authority, has been vigorously defended by Grojean (*loc. cit.*, p. 182 ff.): 'Dira-t-on que le talent de la Sale, que son genre d'esprit, l'empêchèrent d'écrire les *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* autant que les *Quinze Joyes*? Il a pourtant écrit le *Réconfort* avec une sobriété adroite et une sûre entente de l'effet dramatique. Il y a dans *la Salade,* comme dans *la Sale,* plus d'une page alerte, pleine d'humeur, et qui le montre écrivain caustique et observateur avisé du monde extérieur; plus d'une page qui le représente exerçant le contrôle d'une intelligence aiguisée et critique; plus d'une page qui le dénonce teinté d'un scepticisme narquois. Suivez-le aux îles Lipari, en quête d'impressions ou d'histoires pittoresques, auxquelles se mêle un peu de fantastique. Comme on sent qu'il ne croit pas aux esprits d'Estrongol et de Boulcan! Ecoutez-le redire la légende de la reine Sibylle...il justifie par de savants arguments son incrédulité, et à la fin il badine, il plaisante!' He sees in Antoine de la Sale, not, as Nève does, a 'romancier moraliste,' faithful to the ideals of his youth, but a '*duplex homo*' (he insists on this point especially in regard to *Saintré*), swayed by his surroundings, reflecting the dual character of Burgundian literature: 'Cette dualité s'explique cependant. De la Sale, on l'a dit, est un *homo duplex.* Comme son œuvre, sa vie est double. Ne devait-il pas commencer par être le compagnon du dernier roi chevaleresque, épris de tournois et de courtoisie, le 'bon roi René,' pour aller finir son existence à la cour du premier souverain moderne, ami des gais propos et diplomate astucieux, le rusé "grand-duc d'Occident," Philippe le Bon? Ses œuvres, *la Salade, la Sale, le Réconfort,* les *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles,* et sans doute aussi le *Saintré,* sont des œuvres de circonstance. C'est pour cela qu'elles reflètent admirablement le caractère du temps où elles virent le jour. Et—qu'on y prenne garde en effet—c'est à un âge de transition que nous avons affaire. La chevalerie va disparaître: elle agonise. Les tournois ne sont plus qu'un faste menteur. Ces mêmes chevaliers qui avaient fondé la "Cour Amoureuse" pour honorer les "dames," prendront plaisir à entendre conter les gaillardes nouvelles, ou à lire le roman ambigu où la femme est précipitée de son piédestal... On promet la Croisade contre les Turcs, mais c'est une mode à laquelle on ne croit plus, et plusieurs des vœux eux-mêmes ne sont que des "gabs" et des plaisanteries... Ce souffle d'ironie désenchantée a passé sur l'œuvre d'Antoine de la Sale. Elle est bien de son époque: ellé réfléchit ce mélange de dévot et de profane, d'idéalisme surhumain et de grossièreté goguenarde qui caractérisent aussi l'esprit et le goût bourguignons[1].'

---

[1] Cf. G. Paris, *Esquisse*, p. 248: 'Pour être digne de celle qui l'aime ingénument, Saintré va guerroyer en Prusse, et accomplit des exploits aussi merveilleux que ceux des chansons de geste les plus aventureuses; quand il rentre en France, il trouve sa belle, une très grande dame, au pouvoir d'un gras et riche abbé, dont les séductions sont d'un ordre tout matériel; il se venge de lui et d'elle d'une façon fort brutale, et le beau rêve du début finit dans un réalisme désenchanté. C'est l'idéal du moyen âge qui s'effondre; Louis XI, avec qui Antoine de La Salle fut en relations, dut trouver le livre à son goût.'

We believe that both Nève and Grojean have been carried too far by their partisanship in their endeavour to fathom Antoine de la Sale's impressionable and baffling nature. His personality, when all is said, appears as vague and elusive, fluctuating from work to work according to the exigencies of the moment. The trend of his thought and the general character of his authentic writings certainly bear out Nève's interpretation; on the other hand the *Réconfort* and the last part of *Saintré*, as well as more than one purple patch in the remaining works, show that he was capable of almost anything, and reveal him as a kind of literary purveyor whose extraordinary talent is displayed by chance only, as it were, and almost unconsciously. 'Il est,' to quote Söderhjelm's happy comparison, 'comme une machine qui met en mouvement diverses industries littéraires, mais qui fonctionne toujours bien. Il compose et il façonne son style selon les besoins de chaque ouvrage.'

Thus we are led to the conclusion that it is through no lack of genius that Antoine de la Sale can be ruled out as the author of either of the disputed works. His *Petit Jehan de Saintré* alone suffices to prove the contrary.

A comparison of the syntax and style of *Saintré* and the other authentic works with those of the *Quinze Joyes* and the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, confirms the conclusion that Antoine de la Sale is not the author of either of the last two works[2]. The following peculiarities, for example, which occur in *Saintré*[1] or the other authentic works, are conspicuous by their absence in the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* and the *Quinze Joyes*:

---

[1] Grojean forgets that none of Antoine de la Sale's authentic works, now that *Saintré* has been proved to have been written before his stay at Genappe, can be shown to belong to Burgundian literature.

[2] In order to prove the contrary, Stern (*loc. cit.*, p. 148) collates passages from *Saintré* and the disputed works, in which he sees resemblances which are so vague and general that they fail to carry conviction. Here are a few parallels he draws between *Saintré* and the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*: 'Les yeulx, archiers du cueur, peu à peu commencerent

(*a*) The pronominal adverb *où* without an antecedent and referring to a whole clause: 'lors commencerent l'ung à l'aultre festoyer, où furent mains baisiers donnez et mains rendus' (*Saintré*, p. 204); 'lors fut la grant messe ditte, les laudes et commendasses aussi, et l'enffant en terre mis, où ne avait homme ne femme grant ne petit, que de cuer et de larmes grant deuil ne feist' (*Réconfort*, p. 137).

(*b*) The old dative form *nullui* is frequent in all the authentic works.

(*c*) *Quelconque* as an indefinite adjective (= *n'importe quel*, or as a concessive = *quelque*): 'Especialement dudit seigneur don Henry que, à prieres de pere, de freres, ne de quelzconques aultres, son grant dueil ne cessoit' (*Réconfort*, p. 148); 'pour quelconque excusation que j'ai faict' (*Saintré*, p. 286).

(*d*) The hypothetical subjunctive in incomplete exclamatory conditions, as in Old French: 'Lors veissiez de regret et de pitié tous souspirer' (*Saintré*, p. 221).

(*e*) *estre pour* with the infinitive, expressing a near future: 'Quand ilz furent pour devoir monter en la nef' (*La Salade*, p. 212); 'et quant je fuz pour monter à cheval, il m'envoia quarante florins' (*Saintré*, p. 157).

(*f*) The present participle with passive force: 'Du demourer fut moult prié, mais pour neant fut, car le retour estoit à luy si desirant que dire ne se porroit' (*La Salade*, p. 199).

---

l'ung des cueurs à l'autre traire' (*Saintré*, p. 230), and: 'Comme il est de coustume, les yeux d'elle, archiers du cueur, descochèrent tant de flèches en la personne dudit bourgeois' (*Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, I, i). 'Les pies, couverts de la tres large touaille jusques à terre, commencerent de peu à peu l'ung à l'autre toucher, et puis l'ung sur l'autre marcher' (*Saintré*, pp. 230, 255), and: 'Quand il veoit son point, il prestoit ses yeux à l'ostesse, sans espergner par dessous la table le gracieux jeu de piez' (*C. N. N.*, I, 197). 'Or faulce et desloyalle, telle, telle et telle que vous estes' (*Saintré*, p. 270) and: 'Faulce et desloyalle que vous estes' (*C. N. N.*, I, 216). 'Et là furent donnez baisiers, et baisiers rendus, sans compte et sans mesure, tous accompagnez de piteux soupirs' (*Saintré*, p. 92), and; 'Baisiers donnez, baisiers rendus, tant et si longuement' (*C. N. N.*, I, 3). He also adduces what he considers to be a similarity in language, ideas and spirit between the *Quinze Joyes* and la Sale's known writings, but here again the result is equally futile. Chivalry and knightly courage, says Stern, are lauded, as in *Saintré*; the closing words of *Saintré* recall the satire on marriage and women, and have the same pitiless ring as the refrain in the *Quinze Joyes*. When the heroine in *Saintré*, Stern concludes, shams illness, we cannot help recognising at once de la Sale—the same de la Sale who in the *Quinze Joyes* depicts with so much truth and humour the cunning tricks and hypocrisy of the female sex!

[1] *Saintré* is quoted according to Hellény's edition; and *Le Réconfort*, *La Salade* and *La Sale*, according to Nève, *op. cit.*, 1903.

(*g*) The very frequent use of *estre* = *aller*: 'Alors le seigneur envoia à Chastel ouvrir la porte, et de desir lui meismes y fust' (*Réconfort*, p. 133).

(*h*) The temporal conjunction *quand* expressing a causal relation: 'Remercia...le très hault et puissant Dieu, quant du cueur de une femeline et piteuse creature partoient sy haultes et sy vertueuses parolles' (*Réconfort*, p. 122).

(*i*) The very frequent use of *mie*, absent in the *Quinze Joyes*, and rare in the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles.*

(*j*) The use of absolute *plus* = *davantage, de plus, plus longtemps*: 'ceste nouvelle manderent au seigneur de Pacs, son frère, qui tant en fut dolent, que plus ne povoit' (*La Sale*, p. 212).

(*k*) Adverbial *tant* in affirmative clauses: 'tant comme je puis et sçay, humblement je vous en remercie' (*Saintré*, p. 134).

(*l*) *Entre*, meaning 'together,' introducing a compound subject, as frequently in Old French, is often found in *Saintré*: 'vous sçavez qu'entre nous femmes sommes malades' (p. 339–40).

(*m*) To express contemporaneous time relations, de la Sale employs almost exclusively *endementiers que*, occasionally replaced by *entandis que*, both of which are unknown in the doubtful works.

(*n*) The old French rule as regards word-order, when the imperative is introduced by a word such as *or*, or *quar*: 'or me dites vostre intencion' (*Saintré*, p. 50).

(*o*) A striking fondness for adverbial *aucun* in the locution *aucun peu*, of which I have counted at least ten examples in the *Réconfort* and several in *Saintré.*

(*p*) The present participle adverbially modified as a noun: 'Les mieulx chantans; le mieulx dansant' (*Saintré*, pp. 118, 119).

(*q*) The use of the preposition *entour* for *autour.*

(*r*) The concessive conjunction *par ainsi que*: 'et vostre bon folcon, je le retiens, par ainsi que je me le retiendrai' (*Saintré*, p. 412).

(*s*) The use of the reflexive mood for the passive, where in modern French it would not be permissible: 'en vérité, il se doit bien aimer' (*Saintré*, p. 133); 'riens fors le aresque ne lui demouroit comme partout ce (= se) dist' (*La Sale*, p. 240).

(*t*) The failure to repeat an auxiliary verb, even though one of the participles demands a different auxiliary from the preceding one: 'quant le seigneur de Saintré et celle noble et chevaleresque compaignie furent venuz à Sainct Denys, et faictes en l'église leurs devocions, furent au devant d'eulx les trois seigneurs ducs' (*Saintré*, p. 315); 'les cueurs...dont vous en estes tres faulcement et maulvaisement serviz, et puis à la fin habandonnez' (*ibid.*, p. 419).

(*u*) Similarly the omission of the second auxiliary with a changed subject: 'Et quant serai en vostre pourpoint laccé et vos chausses bien nectes et bien tendues' (*Saintré*, p. 64); 'Saintré fut tout de neuf et ses gens bien habillez' (*ibid.*, p. 121).

(*v*) *mander* followed by the plain infinitive: 'le Pape manda incontinent rompre l'entrée de la cave' (*La Salade*, p. 209).

(*w*) A fondness for the pleonastic possessive in such expressions as the following: 'ce chevalier poullain dont ses armes sont publiées' (*Saintré*, p. 211); 'vous avez veu et oi de ce prince son rigoureux parler' (*Réconfort*, p. 116).

(*x*) The present subjunctive in *si*-clauses to express a wish or future contingency: 's'aulcune male veuillance ou nouvelle en adviengne, il s'en excusera et se deschargera du tout sur vous' (*Saintré*, p. 399); 'se pour obeir à vostre vraye honneur, nous soyons desgarnis de notre seul et très amé filz' (*Réconfort*, p. 130).

(*y*) Noticeable also is the frequent occurrence of anacolutha and changes of construction: 'Le povre tout esbahy, et ainsi gehenné d'elles, force luy fut de dire oui' (*Saintré*, p. 23); 'ceulx qui errent en toutes choses sans raison, tout se peut amender, fors que les erreurs désordonnées, guerres et batailles' (*ibid.*, p. 49); 'et nous sçavons que se ma dame sçavoit que de nous venist, suis acertiné qu'elle n'en seroit mie contente' (*ibid.*, p. 60); 'le roy, qui par ses gracieusetez et par les bons raports qu'il en avoit, l'accorda très voulentiers' (*ibid.*, p. 94).

These involved constructions, particularly in long sentences, are typical of de la Sale's manner and distinguish it sharply from the crisp, racy style of the *Quinze Joyes* and the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, which both manage long sentences and balance their periods much more deftly than the author of *Saintré*, who also betrays his awkwardness by the frequent use of stop-gaps and ready-made tags. It is likewise remarkable that not a single comparison, simile or proverb is common to *Saintré* and the *Quinze Joyes*, as is pointed out by Haag (*op. cit.*, p. 39 ff.), who also notes that none of the frequent turns and phrases of the *Quinze Joyes* is to be met in *Saintré*; and that the two works also stand quite apart with regard to the words used to introduce the speaker in the dramatic episodes. Comparing the style and language of *Saintré* with the *Quinze Joyes*, Haag looks upon the author of the former as an 'altmodischer Stelzengänger,' whereas the author of the latter is, in his judgment, a reasonable progressist with a real instinct for stylistic effects. This is true also in the main of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, and we agree with Nève (*op. cit.*, 1903, p. 79): 'La phrase s'est affranchie en même temps que l'idée; elle a secoué la raideur gothique, elle est claire et vive, émaillée de mots choisis avec art et tout pleins de sous-entendus et de finesses.' This view coincides with Shepard's finding; he remarks (*loc. cit.*, p. 500) that the syntax of *Saintré* agrees on the whole most closely with that of Alain Chartier, who, it will be remembered, wrote in the second decade of the fifteenth century. General agreement in matters of syntax between Antoine de la Sale and Alain Chartier, however, does not, for reasons already stated, warrant the conclusion that *Saintré* is an older work than the *Quinze Joyes*. The syntax and style of *Saintré* is undoubtedly archaic; but this tendency to archaism is characteristic of the authentic works, which were all written in the fifties of the fifteenth century. Antoine de la Sale, who did not start writing till well advanced in years, was a bookish person, a great *laudator temporis acti*, 'le bon temps de jadiz,' as he calls it, with an eye ever on the past. He modelled his style intentionally on the preceding courtly literature, and not, like the authors of the *Quinze Joyes* and the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, on the contemporary spoken language.

To conclude, we have no hesitation, in the light of the evidence set forth, in stating:

(i) that Antoine de la Sale cannot be the author of the *two* disputed works;

(ii) that he is certainly not the author of the *Quinze Joyes*;

(iii) that it is decidedly improbable that he compiled and edited the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*.

The burden of proof now lies with those who assert the contrary. We do not pretend to have added very many new facts, though we have devoted a good deal of independent research to several aspects of the subject. All we claim is to have weighed and sifted the evidence for and against Antoine de la Sale's authorship with care and we hope with impartiality, and to have devoted no little thought and time to an intricate and fascinating problem which has exercised the minds and ingenuity of a succession of scholars for wellnigh fifty years.

Some scholars (e.g. Doutrepont) hold that we ought to wait for that 'travail d'ensemble' for which Raynaud was hoping in 1906, before attempting to pass a final verdict. With all due respect, we venture to think that the material now available is sufficient to justify such an attempt. Whether the foregoing pages carry conviction or not, we trust they may contribute to stimulate in this country interest for a writer, who, when all deductions are made, remains one of the ornaments of French prose in the fifteenth century. If the *Quinze Joyes* and the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* must, as we think, be removed from Antoine de la Sale's literary baggage, he will occupy a less exalted, though sufficiently high rank in the annals of French literature. On the other hand, the man himself, whose personality is so irresistibly attractive, will gain from the point of view of unity and dignity of character; and for our part, we prefer the latter alternative.

L. E. KASTNER.

MANCHESTER.

THE LAURENTIAN TEXT (*COD. LAURENT.* XXIX, 8) OF DANTE'S LETTER TO THE ITALIAN CARDINALS (*EPIST.* VIII).

WITH EMENDED TEXT AND TRANSLATION.

DANTE'S letter to the Italian Cardinals (*Epist.* VIII in the *Oxford Dante*) has been preserved (unfortunately in a very corrupt text[1]), in one MS. only, in the Laurentian Library at Florence (XXIX, 8), the well-known so-called *Zibaldone Boccaccesco,* which contains also Dante's letter to a Pistojan exile (*Epist.* IV), and his letter to a Friend in Florence (*Epist.* IX), of neither of which is any other MS. known. This MS., which was executed probably about the year 1348, belonged to Boccaccio, and the portion containing the three letters of Dante, and certain other pieces[2], is in his handwriting[3].

This letter, which was addressed by Dante to the Italian Cardinals in conclave at Carpentras after the death of Clement V (20 April, 1314), and is one of those mentioned by Villani in his account of the poet ('In tra l'altre fece tre nobili pistole; l'una mandò al reggimento di Firenze dogliendosi del suo esilio sanza colpa; l'altra mandò allo 'mperadore Arrigo...; la terza a' cardinali italiani, quand' era la vacazione dopo la morte di papa Clemente, acciocchè s'accordassono a eleggere papa Italiano')[4], was first printed in part[5] by Carlo Troya at Florence in 1826, in the Appendix to his work *Del Veltro Allegorico di Dante* (pp. 214—16). The remainder was printed in September of the same year in the

---

[1] Consequently editors of the letter have indulged pretty freely in conjectural emendations. I have been able to restore the MS. reading in a considerable number of passages; but, as will be seen, I have myself introduced a certain number of conjectural emendations, some of my own, others kindly communicated by my friend the Principal of Brasenose (Dr Heberden), to whom, as well as to other members of the Oxford Dante Society, I am indebted for many valuable criticisms and suggestions.

[2] Namely, the letter of Frate Ilario to Uguccione della Faggiuola, and the Latin poetical correspondence between Dante and Giovanni del Virgilio.

[3] See Hauvette, *Notes sur des Manuscrits autographes de Boccace à la Bibliothèque Laurentienne*, pp. 50 ff.

[4] IX, 136.

[5] Troya printed the first portion of the letter, with the omission of certain words, as far as the middle of § 4 ('vehiculum habeatis').

Antologia Fiorentina (xxiii, 57—9) by Karl Witte, who in the following year (1827) printed the whole letter at Padua in his *Dantis Alligherii Epistolae quae exstant* (*Epist.* vii, pp. 53—61). Witte's text was reprinted, with certain modifications, by Fraticelli at Florence in 1840 in *Dantis Alighieri Epistolae quae exstant* (*Epist.* iv, pp. 256—74). In 1842 Torri reprinted the letter at Leghorn, in a text based on that of Witte and Fraticelli, in his *Epistole di Dante Allighieri edite e inedite* (*Epist.* xii, pp. 82—90). In 1845 an improved text, based upon a fresh collation of the MS., was printed at Prato by Luigi Muzzi in *Tre Epistole Latine di Dante Allighieri restituite a più vera lezione* (*Epist.* i, pp. 11—18). In 1857 Fraticelli republished his text at Florence, with a few emendations, in his *Opere Minori di Dante* (ed. 1893, vol. iii, *Epist.* ix, pp. 486—94). A revised text, embodying certain of Muzzi's emendations, and containing a number of arbitrary emendations of his own, was published at Florence in 1882 by Giuliani in the second volume of his *Opere Latine di Dante* (*Epist.* viii, pp. 27—31). Fraticelli's revised text was reprinted in the *Oxford Dante* (*Epist.* viii, pp. 411—13) in 1894, and was reissued unaltered in the second (1897) and third (1904) editions of that work.

The latest reprint is that of Passerini[1] in his edition of *Le Opere Minori di Dante Alighieri*, vi (*Epist.* viii, pp. 80—94) published at Florence in 1910. In 1912 a diplomatic transcript of the MS. text was published by Rostagno in an article *Sul testo della 'Lettera di Dante ai Cardinali italiani,'* which was issued in the November number of the Florentine periodical *La Bibliofilia* for that year. A review of this article (which was originally printed in a separate form, 'per nozze'), by Parodi, appeared in the *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana* in the following year (N.S. xix, 269—70).

At the end of the year 1914, a facsimile of the whole of *Cod. Laurent.* xxix, 8 was published at Florence[2]. By means of this facsimile I have been able to make a fresh transcript of the MS. text of *Epist.* viii, which is printed below, together with an *apparatus criticus*, in which are registered variant readings from the printed editions enumerated above.

---

[1] Passerini's reprint, as in the case of other letters in his edition (see *M. L. R.* vii, 223 n. 1; xi. 63 n. 2; xii. 38, 302 n. 3), is disfigured by several careless misprints, among which may be mentioned *exctinctam* (l. 13), *interarat* (l. 48), *culumbas* (l. 56), *cognivistis* (l. 149), and *es* (for *et*, l. 161). [Since this article was written yet another text of the letter has been printed, in the volume *De Monarchia e De Vulgari Eloquentia con le Epistolae e la Quaestio de Aqua et Terra di Dante Alighieri* of the reissue of Barbèra's *Collezione Diamante* (Firenze, 1917). In this text use has been made of the diplomatic transcript of the MS. text printed by Rostagno in 1912; but unfortunately this text also (which is published anonymously) is disfigured by misprints, e.g. *intuens. Qui* (ll. 9—10), *vox* (l. 62), *sola* (l. 144), *peregrinantem* (for *peregrinante*, l. 181), etc.]

[2] *Lo Zibaldone Boccaccesco Mediceo Laurenziano* (Plut. xxix, 8). In Firenze, presso Leo Olschki, mcmxiv. (See *M. L. R.* xi, 63.)

The various editions, etc., are represented in the *apparatus criticus* as follows:

Tr. = Troya (1826); W. = Witte (1827); F^1. = Fraticelli (1840); T. = Torri (1842); M. = Muzzi (1845); F^2. = Fraticelli (1857); G. = Giuliani (1882); O. = Oxford Dante (1904); P. = Passerini (1910); R. = Rostagno (1912); Tr.—P. = Tr. W. F^1. T. M. F^2. G. O. P.

Appended is a trial list of proposed emendations in the 'standard' text as printed in the *Oxford Dante*, together with a transcript of the text as provisionally emended, and a provisional English translation of the same.

As in the case of the previous transcripts printed in this *Review*, the contractions of the MS. have been expanded, the expansions being printed in italics. The punctuation of the MS. has been preserved. For convenience of reference, as before, the text of the letter has been broken up into paragraphs, numbered [in square brackets] to correspond with the numbering of the sections in the *Oxford Dante*. In the MS. the letter, which follows a letter of the Emperor Frederick II beginning 'Clerici Romane Ecclesie,' and immediately precedes Dante's letter to a Pistojan exile, occupies ll. 19—55 (numbered in round brackets in the transcript) of fol. 62^{vo}, and ll. 1—23 of fol. 63^{ro}, title and text being written continuously.

[fol. 62^{vo}.] (19) Cardinalib*us* ytalicis. D*antes* de flo*rentia* *et cetera*[1]

[§ 1.] Quom*odo* sola sedet ciuitas plena populo f*acta* *est* q*uasi* uidua d*omi*na gen*tium* p*r*incipu*m* (20) *condam*[2] fariseo*rum* cupiditas / q*ue* sacerdotiu*m* uetus abhominabile fec*it* *non* m*odo* leuitice p*r*olis ministeriu*m* tra*n*stulit q*ui*n (21) *et* p*re* electe ciuitati dauid ossidione*m* pepe*r*it *et* ruina*m*[3] Q*uo*d q*ui*de*m* d*e* specula puctal*is* ect*er*nitatis[4] i*n*tuen*s* q*ui* solus ect*ernus* e*st*. m*en*te*m* (22) deo dingnia*m* uiri p*r*ophetici[5] p*er* sp*iritu*m s*anctu*m sua iussione[6] i*m*p*r*essit Et s*anct*am[7] ier*usa*le*m*[8] uelud extinta*m* p*er* uerba p*r*esingniata *et* (23) nimiu*m* p*r*o dolor iterata de fleuit.

[§ 2.] Nos q*uoque* ide*m*[9] patre[10] *et* filiu*m*. eu*n*de*m* deu*m* *et*[11] ho*m*ine*m*

---

[1] Tr. *D. de Florentia Epistola*; W. *Dantis de Florentia Epistola*; F^1.T.G.O.P. *Dantes Aligherius* (F^1. T. *Alligherius*; G. *Allagherius*) *de Florentia*; M. *D. de Florentia, etc.* F^2. *Dantes Aligherius de Florentia, etc.*; R. does not expand the second half of title.

[2] Tr. W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *quondam*; M. *condomina*.

[3] W. omits *quin—ruinam*.

[4] Tr. *de specula aeternitatis*; W.F^1.T. *de specula...ae.*; M. *de s. provecta vel ae.*; F^2.O.P. *de s. provecta ae.*; G. *de s. praealta ae.*

[5] Tr. *prophetici viri.*

[6] Tr. W.F^1.T.F^2.O.P. *jussione*; M. *ustione*; G. *justione.*

[7] F^2.G.O.P. *et is s.*

[8] Tr. omits.

[9] Tr. W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *eundem*; M. *idem.*

[10] Tr.—P. *patrem.*

[11] Tr. W.F^1.T. *ac.*

nec n*on* ea*n*de*m* matre*m* *et*[1] uirgine*m* p*r*ofite*n*-(24)-tes. p*r*opt*er* quos *et* p*r*opt*er* q*uo*ru*m* salute*m* / ter de carite[2] i*n*terogatu*m*[3] d*ictu*m e*st*[4] petre pasce sacros*anct*am ouile*m*[5] romana*m* / cui[6] post tot (25) triu*m*phoru*m* pompas / *et* uerbo *et* op*e*re chr*istu*s orbis co*n*firmauit i*m*p*eriu*m / qua*m* *etiam*[7] ille petrus *et* paulus gentiu*m* p*re*dicator (26) i*n* apostolica*m* sede*m* asp*er*gine p*r*opij[8] sangu*in*is co*n*secrauit[9] / cu*m* ieremia[10] n*on* lugenda[11] post uenie*n*tes. s*ed* post ips*o*[12] dole*n*-(27)-tes / uidua*m* *et* dis*er*ta*m* lug*er*e co*m*pellimur. Piget[13] heu no*n* minus q*uam* plaga*m*[14] lamentabile*m* cernerei[15] heresiu*m*.

[§ 3.] i*m*pie-(28)-tatis fautores. iudei[16] saraceni egentes[17]. sabb*at*a n*os*tra ride*n*t *et* ut fertur co*n*clama*n*t ubi *est* deus eoru*m* Et q*uod* (29) forsan[18] suis i*n*sidijs apotestate pote*n*tes *contra*[19] defensantes ang*e*los hoc asscribu*nt* *et*[20] q*uod* horribili*us* e*st* q*uod*[21] astrono-(30)-mij q*ui*da*m* *et* crude p*r*ophetantes necessariu*m* ass*er*u*nt*[22] / q*uod* male usi[23] libertate arbitrij eligere maluistis[24].

[§ 4.] vos e-(31)-q*ui*de*m* eccl*es*ie milita*n*tis ueluti[25] primi p*re*positi pili p*er* manifesta*m* orbitam crucifixi / cursu*m*[26] sp*on*se[27] regere (32) negligentes. no*n* al*ite*r q*uam* falsus auriga pheton exorbitastis / et[28] quoru*m* seque*n*te*m* grege*m* p*er* salt*us* p*er*egri-(33)-nat*io*nis hui*us* i*n*lustrare int*er*erat / ip*su*m una nob*is*cu*m*[29] ad p*r*ecipitiu*m* traduxistis / nec adimita*n*da[30] rece*n*seo[31] cu*m* (34) dorsa no*n* uultus ad spo*n*se uehiculu*m* ha*be*atis[1]. uere[2] dici possetis[3] / q*ui* p*ro*ph*e*te o*st*ensi su*n*t male uersi ad te*m*plu*m* Nob*is*[4] (35) ingne*m* decelo missu*m* d*e*spicientib*us* / ubi n*un*c are ab alieno calescunt / uob*is* colu*m*bas i*n* templo[5] uendentibus (36) ubiq*ue*[6] p*re*tio me*n*surari no*n* possu*n*t i*n* detime*n*tu*m*[7] hi*n*c in*de* co*m*muranciu*m*[8] uenalia f*act*a sunt S*ed* ad te*n*datis[9] ad funi-(37)-culu*m* acte*n*datis[10] ad ingne*m* / neq*ue* patientia*m* co*n*tepnatis illius q*ui* ad penite*n*tia*m* uos expectat / q*uod* side p*re*libato (38) p*re*cipitio dubitatur / q*ui*d aliud d*e*clara*n*do respo*n*dea*m*. nisi q*u*od i*n* alchimu*m* cu*m* demetrio co*n*sensistis ?

---

[1] Tr. *ac*.

[2] Tr.—P. *caritate*.

[3] W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *interrogato*; Tr. M. *interrogatum*.

[4] Tr. omits *dictum est*; M. *et dictum est*.

[5] W. wrongly gives *sacrosanctum ovile* as the reading of the MS.

[6] Tr. M. *pasce sacrosanctum ovile Romanum, cui*; W.T. *pasce sacrosanctum ovile Romanum...Romam, cui*; F^1.F^2.O.P. *pasce sacrosanctum ovile*; *Romam* (*cui*; G. *pasce oves meas, scilicet sacrosanctam Urbem Romam, cui*.

[7] Tr. *quod et*.

[8] Tr.—P. *proprii*.

[9] Tr. W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *consecrarunt*; M. *consecravit*.

[10] So M.; W.T.F^2.G.O.P. *quam nunc cum J.*; F^1. *Romam, quam cum J.*; Tr. omits the whole passage as far as *Piget*.

[11] W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *lugendo*; M. *lugendam*.

[12] W.—P. *ipsum*.

[13] W.T. *compellimur*) *piget*; F^1.G. *compellimur, piget*; M. *compellimur. Piget*; F^2.O.P. *compellimur; piget*.

[14] M. *plagnere*.

[15] So apparently MS., a stroke, which looks like a final *i*, being attached to *cernere*; as this is followed by a point, it is possible that it was meant for the abbreviation of *idest*. Rostagno in his transcript ignores the appended stroke.

[16] Tr. M. *cernere haeresium impietatis fautores. Judaei*; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *cernere haeresium. Impietatis fautores, Judaei*.

[17] So Tr.; W.—P. *et gentes*.

[18] So Tr. M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *et forsan*.

[19] So Tr. M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *insidiis ac potestati contra*.

[20] Tr. omits *et*.

[21] W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. omit *quod*.

[22] Tr. omits *quod—asserunt*.

[23] Tr. *quam male uti*.

[24] Tr. omits *eligere maluistis*.

[25] Tr. *velut*.

[26] So Tr. W.F^1.T.M.; F^2.G.O.P. *currum*.

[27] Tr. *sponte*.

[28] Tr. *in*.

[29] So Tr.; W.—P. *vobiscum*.

[30] Tr. *ad imitanda*; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *ad imitandum*; M. *adeo vitanda*.

[31] W.F^1.T.F^2.O.P. after *recenseo* insert *vobis exempla*.

[§ 5.] forsita*n* (39) *et*[11] q*ui*s iste q*ui* oçe repe*n*tinu*m* suppliciu*m* no*n* formida*n*s ad arca*m*[12] q*uam*uis labante*m* se erigit indingna*nter*[13] obiurgabitis (40) Quippe de ouib*us* pascuis[14] ie*s*u chr*ist*i minima una su*m* q*ui*ppe nulla pastorali auct*oritat*e ab ute*n*s / q*uoniam*[15] diuitie me-(41)-cu*m* non su*n*t / no*n* ergo diuitiar*um* *sed* gr*ati*a dei su*m* id q*uod* su*m* / *et* çelus[16] dom*us* ei*us* co*m*medit[17]. Na*m* *etiam*[18] i*n*ore lacte*n*tiu*m* *et* *in*fa*n*-(42)-tiu*m* sonuit ia*m* deo placida[19] ueritas *et* cec*us* natus ueritate*m* *con*fessus e*st* q*uam* pharisei n*on* m*o*d*o* taceba*nt* *sed* *et* ma-(43)-lingne reflectere conaba*n*tur. Hijs[20] h*ab*eo p*er*suasu*m* q*uod* audeo[21]. h*abe*o[22] p*re*t*er* he*c*[23] p*re*ceptore*m* phi*losoph*u*m* / q*ui* cu*n*ta moralia (44) domatiça*n*s / amicis om*n*ib*us* ueritate*m* docuit[24] p*re*ferenda*m*. nec oçe p*re*su*n*tio / qua*m* obiecta*n*da*m* q*ui*s crederet q*uas*i (45) temere p*ro*ru*m*pe*n*te*m* me i*n*fic*it*[25] sui tabe reatus. q*uia* ille ad arca*m* ego ad boues calcitra*n*tes p*er*[26] abuia distrahe*n*tes[27] (46) actendor[28] Jlle ad arca*m* p*ro*ficiat q*ui* salutiferos oculos ad nauicula*m* fluctua*n*te*m* ap*er*uit[29].

[§ 6.] No*n* itaq*ue* uideor (47) que*m*qua*m* exacerbasse / ad iurgia /

---

[1] The portion of the letter printed by Troya ends at this point.

[2] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *vereque.*

[3] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.O.P. *possitis*; G. *possit.*

[4] W.—P. *vobis.*

[5] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *templis.*

[6] W.—P. *ubi, quae.*

[7] *Sic*; W.—P. *detrimentum.*

[8] W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *haec ad commutandum*; M. *hinc inde commutantium.*

[9] F^1. *non attendatis.*

[10] F^1. *non attendatis.*

[11] As R. notes, *et* has been written on the margin (apparently by a different hand, at any rate in a different ink) for insertion before *quis*; W.—P. *Forsitan et.*

[12] So M.F^2.G.O.P.; W.F^1.T. *aram.*

[13] So F^2.G.O.P.; W.F^1.T. *indignati*; M. *indignantius.*

[14] G. *pascui.*

[15] So M.F^2.G.O.P.; W.F^1.T. *quum.*

[16] W. wrongly gives *coelus* as the reading of the MS.

[17] W.F^1.T.F^2.O.P. *me comedit*; M.G. *comedit me* (so Vulg.; cf. *Psalm* lxviii, 10 (A.V. lxix, 9); *John* ii, 17).

[18] So F^2.G.O.P.; W.F^1.T.M. *et.*

[19] So W.F^1.T.M.; F^2.G.O.P. *placita.*

[20] W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *His*; M. *Hisce.*

[21] So F^1.M.F^2.O.P.; W.T. *audio*; G. *dico.*

[22] G. *audio.*

[23] W.—P. *hoc.*

[24] So M.F^2.G.O.P.; W.F^1.T. *docuit veritatem.*

[25] So M.; W.F^1.T. *prorumpentem, inficietur*; F^2.G.O.P. *prorumpentem me inficiet.*

[26] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *et per.*

[27] F^1. *dirtrabentes*!

[28] W.—P. *attendo.*

[29] W.F^1.T. omit *Ille—aperuit.*

q*ui*n poti*us* co*n*fusionis[1] rubore*m* *et* i*n* uob*is* *et* alijs[2] no*mine* solo archima*n*dritis (48) p*er* orbem du*m*taxat pudor eradicat*us* no*n* sit total*iter* acce*n*disse Cu*m* detot pastoris[3] offi*cium* usurpa*n*tibus[4]. (49) detot ouib*us* *et* sino*n* abactis[5] neglectis t*amen* *et* i*n*custoditis i*n* pascuis una sola uox sola pia *et* hec p*r*iua-(50)-ta i*n* matris eccl*es*ie q*uas*i funere audiatur.

[§ 7.] Quid ni ? cupiditate*m* unus q*ui*sq*ue* sibi duxit i*n* uxore*m* / que*m*ad-(51)-modu*m* *et*uos q*ue* nu*n*q*uam* pietatis *et* eq*ui*tatis / ut karitas. s*ed* semp*er* inpietatis *et* iniq*ui*tatis e*st* genitrix[6] Ha mat*er* (52) pijssima sponsa chr*ist*i q*ue* i*n* aqua *et* sp*irit*u gen*er*as[7] tibi filios ad rubore*m*. No*n* caritas no*n* astrea. s*ed* filias[8] sanguis-(53)-suce f*act*e sunt tibi nurus / q*ue* quales paria*n*t tibi fetus / p*re*t*er* lune*n*sem po*n*tificem om*n*es alij co*n*testant*ur* (54) Jacet gregori*us* tuus i*n*[9] telis aranear*um* Jacet ambrosius i*n* neglectis cl*er*icor*um* latibulis Jacet augustin*us*(55) adiectus[10] / dyonisius damascenus[11] *et* beda / *et* nescio[12] q*uo*d speculu*m* Jnnoce*n*tiu*m* *et* hostie*n*sem[13] declama*nt*. [fol. 63ro] Cur no*n*[14] illi deu*m* q*ue*rebant ut fine*m* *et*optimu*m* Jsti ce*n*sus *et* bene*f*itia co*n*secu*n*t*ur*.

[§ 8.] S*ed* opatres ne me fenice*m* extimetis[15] inorbe*m*[16] t*er*ra*rum* (2) Om*nes* e*nim* q*ue* garrio murmura*n*t / aut musant aut cogitant aut sonia*nt*[17] / et q*ue*[18] i*n*uenta no*n* attestantur. no*n* ulli[19] su*nt* i*n* am-(3)-irat*io*ne suspensi / an semp*er* *et* hoc[20] silebu*nt* neq*ue* fac*t*ori suo testimoniu*m* reddent. Viuit d*ominus* q*uia* q*ui* mouit[21] lingua*m* i*n* asina*m*[22] (4) balaam. d*omin*us e*st* *etiam* modernor*um* brutor*um*.

---

[1] As R. notes, this word has been corrected from *confusionem* apparently by the original copyist (i.e. Boccaccio himself).

[2] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *et in aliis*.

[3] As R. notes, this word has been altered apparently from *pastoribus* by a later hand.

[4] W.F^1.T. omit *de tot—usurpantibus*.

[5] As R. notes, in the MS. the *c* of this word has been expunctuated by a later hand, and *i* has been inserted above the line after *b*; M. says that the superscript letter is *l*, and consequently reads *ablatis*; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *abactis*.

[6] W. wrongly gives *genitrice* as the reading of the MS.

[7] So M.; W.F^1.T. *quos in aqua a spiritu generas*; F^2.G.O.P. *quos in a. et s. g.*; W. wrongly gives *quae in aq. a sp. generans* as the reading of the MS.

[8] W.—P. *filiae*.

[9] R. *tuu sin*.

[10] W.—P. *abjectus*.

[11] So M.F^2.O.P.; W.F^1.T.G. *Damianus*.

[12] M. *non scio*.

[13] After this word in the MS. *uocant* has been written and crossed out.

[14] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *Cur enim*.

[15] W.F^1.T. *existimetis*; M.F^2.G.O.P. *aestimetis*.

[16] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *in orbe*.

[17] W.F^1.T. *murmurant, aut mussant, aut somniant* (F^1. *sommiant*); M. *murmurant aut mussant aut cogitant aut somniant*; F^2.G.O.P. *murmurant, aut cogitant, aut somniant*.

[18] So M.; W.F^1.T.P^2.G.O.P. *qui*.

[19] W. *attestantur. Nonnulli*; F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *attestantur ? Nonnulli*; M. *attestantur nonnulli*.

[20] W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *hi*; M. *haec*.

[21] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *d. quique movit*.

[22] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O. *in asina*.

[§ 9.] ia*m* garrulus f*a*c*t*us su*m*. uos me coegistis. pudeat *er*go ta*m* abi*n*fra no*n* d*e* celo. ut (5) absoluet[1] argui *ue*l moneri Recte q*ui*de*m* nobi*s*cu*m* agit cu*m* exea p*ar*te pulsat*ur* adnos ad q*uam* cu*m* ceteris sensib*us* i*n*flet au-(6)-ditu*m* ac pariat pudor i*n* nob*is* / p*en*itudine*m*[2] p*r*imogenita*m* sua*m* *et* hoc p*ro*positu*m*[3] eme*n*dat*i*o*n*is aggen*e*ret /.

[§10.] q*uo*d ut[4] gl*ori*osa[5] lo*n*-(7)-ganimitas foueat *et*de fendat. Roma*m* urbe*m* nu*n*c utroq*ue* lumine destituta*m*. Nu*n*c anibal[6] nedu*m* alij[7] mis*e*ra*n*-(8)-da[8] sola*m* sedente*m* *et* uidua*m* p*ro*ut sup*er*i*us* p*ro*clamatur. qual*is* e*st* p*ro* modulo u*est*re imaginis. an*te* me*n*tales[9] oculo[10] affigatis (9) o*portet*[11] Et ad uos hec su*n*t maxime q*ui* sacru*m* tybru*m*[12] p*ar*uuli congniouistis Na*m* *et* si latiale capud pie cu*n*tis[13] e*st*· ytal*is*[14] (10) diligendu*m* ta*n*q*uam* co*mun*e sue ciuilitatis principiu*m* / u*est*ra[15] iuste ce*n*set*ur* accuratissime colere·ip*sum* cu*m* sit uobis (11) principiu*m* ciuilitatis e*ss*e ip*sum* q*uoque*[16] *et* si ceteros ytalos i*m*p*resens* mis*er*ia dolore co*n*fe*cit* *et* rubore co*n*fudit Erubesce*n*-(12)-du*m* ess*e*[17] uob*is* dolendu*m*[18] q*ui*s dubitet ? q*ui* *causa*m[19] i*n*solite sui *ue*l sol*is* eclips*is* cu*m* fuistis[20]. tu*m*[21] p*re* om*n*ib*us* urse[22] ne degrattati[23] (13) college p*o*p*ulo*[24] remanere*n*t i*n* glorij *et* illi ut[25] militantis eccl*es*ie uenera*n*da Jnsingnia q*ue* fo*r*san n*on* emerit[26] s*ed* (14) i*m*meriti cu*n*ti[27] posuera*n*t / apo*sto*lici culm*i*nis auto*r*itate resu*mmer*et[28] Tu q*uoque* tra*n*stiberine septator[29] sa*n*ct*i*onis[30] alt*er*i*us* (15) ut ira[31] defuncti antistitis i*n* te uelud ram*us* i*n*sit*i*onis i*n* tru*n*co n*on* suo frondesceret / q*uod* sitriu*m*phata*m*[32] carta-(16)-gine*m* n*on*du*m* exueras

---

[1] W.—P. *absolvat.*

[2] So M.; W.F^1.T. *rectitudinem*; W. wrongly gives *pcitudinem* as the reading of the MS.; F^2.G.O.P. *poenitentiam.*

[3] So W.F^1.T.; M. *et propositum*; F^2.G.O.P. *et haec p.*

[4] So M.F^2.G.O.P.; W.F^1.T. *quod utinam.*

[5] So M.F^2.G.O.P.; W.F^1.T. *generosa.*

[6] W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *Hannabali*; M. *Annibali*; W. wrongly gives *Annibal* as the reading of the MS.

[7] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *aliis.*

[8] W.—P. *miserandam.*

[9] So M.G.; W.F^1.T.F^2.O.P. *mortales.*

[10] W.—P. *oculos.*

[11] So M.: W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *omnes.*

[12] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *Tiberim.*

[13] M.F^2.G.O.P. *pie cunctis*; W.F^1.T. *cunctis pie.*

[14] So W.—P.; W. wrongly gives *Ytalia* as the reading of the MS.

[15] So W.F^1.T.M.G.; F^2.O.P. *vestras.*

[16] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *quum sit vobis principium ipsius quoque esse.*

[17] So M.F^2.G.O.P.; W.F^1.T. omit *esse.*

[18] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *dolendumque.*

[19] W.—P. *causa.*

[20] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *solis eclipseos fuistis.*

[21] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *Tu.*

[22] G. after *Urse* inserts *quod neglexisti.*

[23] W.—P. *degratiati.*

[24] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *propter te*; R. queries *populo*; the abbreviation in the MS. might equally stand for *proprio* or *propositio.*

[25] So W.F^1.T.M.; F^2.G.O.P. *et ut illi.*

[26] W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *emeriti*; M. *emerint.*

[27] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *coacti.*

[28] W.—P. *resumerent.*

[29] W.—P. *sectator.*

[30] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *factionis.*

[31] G. *ut si ira.*

[32] W.F^1.T.F^2.O.P. *frondesceret, quasi triumphatam*; M. *f., quomodo, si t.*; G. *f., quomodo, quasi t.*

illuxtriu*m* scipionu*m* patrie potuisti hu*n*c a*nim*um sine ulla tui iudicij con*tra*dic*tio*ne p*re*fer-(17)-re[1].

[§ 11.] Em*en*dabit*ur* q*ui*de*m* qu*am*qu*am* no*n* sit / q*ui*n nota cicatrix *in* famis ap*osto*lica*m*[2] sede*m* us*que* ad ingne*m*[3] Cui celi q*uod* nu*n*c sunt (18) *et* t*er*ra su*n*t res*er*uati[4] deturpet Sin[5] unanimes om*n*es q*ui* hui*us*-mo*d*i exorbitat*io*nis fuistis auctores. p*ro* spo*n*-(19)-sa chr*isti* p*ro* sede spo*n*se q*ue* roma es*t*. p*ro* ytalia n*ost*ra *et* ut plenius dica*m* p*ro* tota ciuitate p*er*egrinate[6] *in* t*er*ris uiri-(20)-liter p*ro*pungniatis ut de palestra ia*m* cepti certa*min*is.- undiq*ue* ab occeani margine circu*m*specta. (21) uos met ips*o*s cu*m* gl*o*ria offerentes audire possitis Gl*o*ria i*n* excelsis Et ut uasconu*m* obbrobbiu*m* q*ui* ta*m* (22) dira cupidine cu*m*flagrantes[7]. latinor*um* gl*o*riam sibi usurpare co*n*te*m*pdunt[8]. p*ro*[9] secula cu*n*ta futura sit (23) posteris i*n* exemplu*m*:,

Proposed emendations in the Oxford text of Epist. VIII.

Title. *For* Dantes Aligherius de Florentia *read* (*with MS.*) Dantes (*MS.* D.) de Florentia et cet.

l. 9. *For* de specula provecta *read* (*with Rostagno*) de specula punctali[10] (*MS.* puctalis).

l. 12. *For* et is sanctam Ierusalem *read* (*with MS.*) et sanctam I.

ll. 20—1. *For* ter de caritate interrogato, dictum est *read* (*with Muzzi*) ter de c. interrogatum et dictum est[11].

ll. 21—2. *For* 'Petre, pasce sacrosanctum ovile'; Romam *read* 'Petre, pasce oves meas', scilicet sacrosanctum ovile, Romam[12].

[1] M. *perferre.*

[2] So M. *c. infamis a.*; W.F^1.T.F^2.O.P. *cicatrixque i. a.*; G. *cicatrix infamis, quae a.*

[3] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *usserit ad ignem*; W. wrongly gives *ussit* as the reading of the MS.

[4] So M.; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *et cui coeli et terra sunt r.*; W. wrongly gives *cui celi que sunt* as the reading of the MS.

[5] So M.F^2.; W.F^1.T.G.O.P. *Si.*

[6] So M. *peregrinante*; W.F^1.T.F^2.G.O.P. *peregrinantium.*

[7] W.—P. *conflagrantes.*

[8] The *p* in this word in MS. is expunctuated; W.—P. *contendunt.*

[9] *Sic*; W.—P. *per.*

[10] *Punctalis*, presumably in the sense of 'at the point,' 'at the summit,' hence 'exalted,' 'sublime.' I have not been able to meet with another instance of the word.

[11] The MS. omits *et* after *interrogatum*, the insertion of which is required by the sense, and rectifies the cursus—(interro)gátum et díctum est (*tardus*).

[12] The MS. reads *ter de carite interogatum dictum est petre pasce sacrosanctam ouilem romanam.* There can hardly be a doubt that there is an omission here on the part of the copyist (whose carelessness is evidenced by his writing *carite* for *caritate*), and that Dante must have quoted the actual words of the Vulgate, 'pasce oves meas.' Possibly the original reading was '"Petre, pasce oves meas," scilicet, pasce sacrosanctum ovile, Romam,' in which case the omission may have been due to the repetition of the word 'pasce' (on scribal errors of this nature arising from ὁμοιοτέλευτα, see Moore, *Studies in Dante* IV, 6). The insertion of *scilicet* seems necessary; the abbreviation of which (f.), especially when following another f, might easily have been overlooked by the copyist. The reading here proposed follows in part a suggestion of Giuliani (see also *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.*, N.S. XIX, 269, n, 2).

ll. 27—8. *For* conscrarunt), quam nunc cum Ieremia *read* (*with MS.*) consecrarunt (*MS.* consecrauit[1]), cum Ieremia.

ll. 28—9. *For* non lugendo postvenientes, sed post ipsum dolentes *read* (*with MS.*) non lugenda postvenientes, sed post ipsa (*MS.* ipso) dolentes.

ll. 30—3. *For* compellimur; piget, heu, non minus quam plagam lamentabilem cernere haeresium. Impietatis fautores, Iudaei, *read* compellimur. Piget, heu! non minus quam plagam lamentabilem cernere haeresium, quod[2] impietatis fautores, Iudaei,

ll. 36—7. *For* Et forsan suis insidiis ac potestati contra *read* et quod forsan suis insidiis apostatae[3] (*MS.* apotestate) Potestates[4] (*MS.* potentes) contra

ll. 50—1. *For* Nec ad imitandum recenseo vobis exempla, quum *read* Nec adimitanda vobis recenseo, quum[5].

ll. 56—7. *For* in templis *read* (*with MS.*) in templo.

ll. 58—9. *For* in detrimentum haec ad commutandum *read* (*with MS.*) in d. hinc inde commorantium[6] (*MS.* commurancium).

l. 67. *For* Forsitan et 'quis iste *read* Forsitan 'et quis iste[7].

l. 71. *For* ovibus pascuis[8] *read* ovibus in pascuis.

l. 76. *For* me comedit *read* (*with Vulg.*) comedit me[9].

---

[1] This slip (if it was a slip) on the part of the copyist may be explained by the fact that in the MS. the word *confirmauit* occurs immediately above in the previous line. It is possible, however, that the MS. reading *consecrauit* is correct, for in *Epist.* x Dante twice uses a singular verb with two singular nominatives, viz. 'ratio et auctoritas manifestat' (ll. 353—4); and 'omnis essentia et virtus procedat' (ll. 400—1).

[2] The insertion of *quod* here seems necessary in view of the *et quod forsan* of l. 36 (according to the MS. reading).

[3] I am indebted to Dr Heberden for this brilliant and wholly convincing emendation of the MS. reading *apotestate*, which was no doubt due to the scribe's ignorance of the comparatively unfamiliar *apostate* (= *apostatae*). The word *apostata*, which occurs twice in the Vulgate (viz. *Job* xxxiv, 18; and *Prov.* vi, 16), is registered by Isidore of Seville, Papias, Uguccione da Pisa, and Giovanni da Genova, as well as by Evrard de Béthune in his *Graecismus*.

[4] This emendation gives the required antithesis to the *defensantes Angelos* of l. 37. It is probable that the scribe, having written *apotestate* instead of *apostate*, to avoid the apparent repetition then altered *potestates* into *potentes*. Dante in this passage seems to have had in mind *Ephes.* vi, 11—12.

[5] This is the reading of the MS. save for the insertion of *vobis*, which seems required in view of the *vobis* of ll. 54, 56 (cf. *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.*, N.S. xix, 269).

[6] The use of *commoror* with *hinc inde* is unusual and raises a doubt as to the reading. Dr Heberden suggests to me that the true reading may be *commeantium*.

[7] See *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.*, N.S. xix, 270.

[8] *Pascuus* is used only of land and the like (as 'pascuus ager,' 'pascua rura,' 'pascua silva'), never of animals. Either, therefore, the MS. reading *ovibus pascuis* is corrupt, or it involves a blunder. It is possible, but hardly probable, that Dante may have been misled by such passages of the Vulgate as *Psalm* lxxviii, 13 ('oves pascuae tuae') and *Psalm* xcix, 3 ('oves pascuae ejus'), where *pascuae* is not adj., but gen. sing. of *pascua*. It seems necessary, therefore, to supply *in*, which (in MS. ī) might easily have been overlooked by a careless copyist. The phrase 'in pascuis' occurs in this same letter (l. 100).

[9] *Psalm* lxviii, 10 (Vulg.); MS. omits *me*.

l. 82. *For* praeter hoc *read* (*with MS.*) praeter haec.

l. 87. *For* inficiet *read* (*with MS.*) inficit.

ll. 88—9. *For* calcitrantes et per abvia distrahentes *read* (*with MS.*) calcitrantes per abvia d.

l. 91. *For* aperuit. *read* aperuit!

l. 94. *For* in vobis et in aliis *read* (*with MS.*) in vobis et aliis[1].

ll. 95—6. *For* archimandritis, per orbem (duntaxat *read* archimandritis (per orbem duntaxat.

l. 104. *For* duxit in uxorem *read* duxit uxorem[2].

ll. 108—9. *For* quos in aqua et spiritu generas tibi filios *read* (*with MS.*) quae in aqua et spiritu g. t. f.

ll. 116—17. *For* iacet Augustinus; abiectus Dionysius *read* (*with MS.*) iacet Augustinus adiectus, Dionysius.

l. 119. *For* Cur enim *read* (*with MS.*) Cur non.

l. 123. *For* aestimetis *read* (*with MS.*) extimetis[3].

ll. 124—5. *For* murmurant aut cogitant aut somniant *read* (*with MS.*) murmurant aut mussant[4] (*MS.* musant) aut c. aut s.

ll. 125—6. *For* somniant. Et qui inventa non attestantur? *read* (*with MS.*) somniant, et quae inventa non attestantur.

l. 127. *For* et hi *read* (*with MS.*) et hoc.

l. 129. *For* quique movit *read* (*with MS.*) quia qui movit.

l. 134. *For* de coelo ut absolvat *read* de coelo ut vos absolvat[5].

l. 135. *For* nobiscum agit *read* nobiscum agitur[6].

---

[1] This restores the cursus, giving vóbis et áliis (*tardus*).

[2] The MS. reads *duxit in uxorem*, but the usual phrase is *ducere uxorem*; cf. *Gen.* xxv, 20: 'Isaac duxit uxorem Rebeccam'; xxix, 28: 'Rachel duxit uxorem'; also *Judges* iii, 6; 1 *Kings* vii, 8; xvi, 31; 2 *Chron.* xi, 18; &c. The emendation also improves the cursus—dúxit uxórem (*planus*) (cf. *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.*, N.S. xix, 270).

[3] *Extimare* is a recognized form, which is registered by Giovanni da Genova: '*extimo -mas*, idest, appreciari, vel putare.' It is used several times elsewhere by Dante, e.g. *V.E.* i, 11, l. 8; 15, l. 38; ii, 3, l. 32; the subs. *extimatio* occurs *V.E.* i, 9, l. 78.

[4] Rostagno and Parodi (see *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.*, N.S. xix, 270) think the omission of *aut mussant* justifiable on the ground that it is probably merely a gloss on *murmurant*, but surely this would be a case of explaining 'ignotum per ignotius.'

[5] The insertion of *vos* (which the MS. omits), as Parodi points out (*loc. cit.*), rectifies the cursus—(de) coélo ut vos absólvat (*velox*).

[6] The MS. and all the printed editions read *agit*, but this construes very awkwardly with the *pulsatur* of the next line. I feel very little doubt that Dante wrote not *agit*, but *agitur* (cf. *Epist.* vi, 96: 'Dei iudicio quandoque agi credendum est'). The omission by a careless scribe of the 'tick' (representing *r* superscript) which differentiates *agitur* (*agit*^{2}) from *agit* in MSS. would account for the hitherto accepted reading. The cursus would be a form of *tardus* (nóbiscum ágitur) of which there are numerous instances in Dante's letters; e.g. it occurs at least ten times in *Epist.* vi: (per)cútitur ímpius (l. 64); (ca)cúmina Gélboe (l. 68); (mi)sérrimi hóminum (l. 86); (inflam)mábitur ámplius (ll. 90—1); (utque) bréviter cólligam (l. 122); (in) límine cárceris (l. 147); (sacra)tíssimis légibus (ll. 154—5); (exis)téntibus líberis (l. 163); rívuli cónfluant (l. 178); cómmoda sítiens (l. 182). For the accentuation *nóbiscum*, cf. *Epist.* v, 145: nóbiscum òpinári cogétur; *V.E.* i, 10, l. 71: nóbiscum dìssentíre putámus—a form of clausula (*velox* combined with *planus*), which is common enough in Dante's letters; e.g. (dili)géntiae rèlinquántur, probándae (iv, 39); témere praèsuméndo tuméscunt (vi, 21); (ob)nóxiae vòluntáti aetérnae (v, 140); rábies ìnopína

l. 138. *For* poenitentiam *read* (*with MS.*) poenitudinem[1].

l. 144. *For* nedum aliis *read* (*with MS.*) nedum alii.

ll. 147—8. *For* ante mortales oculos affigatis omnes *read* (*with MS.*) ante mentales oculos[2] (*MS.* oculo) affigatis oportet[3].

l. 152. *For* vestras *read* vestrum[4] (*MS.* uestra).

ll. 158—9. *For* qui causa insolitae sui vel solis eclipseos fuistis *read* qui tantum[5] insolitae sui vel solis eclipsis[6] causa[7] fuistis.

l. 160. *For* ne degratiati collegae propter te *read* (*with MS.*) ne degradati[8] (*MS.* degrattati) collegae populo[9].

l. 161. *For* et ut illi *read* (*with MS.*) et illi ut.

l. 172. *For* praeferre. *read* praeferre?

ll. 173—6. *For* quamquam non sit quin nota cicatrixque infamis Apostolicam Sedem usserit ad ignem, et cui coeli et terra sunt reservati, deturpet *read* (*with MS.*) quamquam non sit quin nota cicatrix infamis Apostolicam Sedem usque ad ignem, cui coeli qui (*MS.* quod) nunc sunt et terra sunt reservati[10], deturpet.

turgéscet (VII, 128); témpora diutúrna felícem (X, *tit.*); etc., etc. On the other hand *vobiscum* in l. 49 appears to be paroxyton: úna vobíscum (*planus*).

[1] *Poenitudo* occurs several times in the Vulgate, e.g. *Deut.* xxx, 1; 1 *Kings* (A.V. 1 *Sam.*) xv, 29; *Hosea* xi, 8. It is registered by Giovanni da Genova, who quotes 1 *Kings* xv, 29 (where *poenitentia* occurs in the same verse).

[2] Dante often uses the phrase 'mentis oculi,' e.g. *Mon.* II, 1, l. 18; *Epist.* II, 30; V, 163 (cf. the second Battifolle letter: 'quatenus mentis oculis intueri dignemini'); *Conv.* II, 5, l. 117 ('gli occhi della mente umana'); *Par.* x, 121 ('l'occhio della mente').

[3] Dante generally uses the construction of *oportet* with inf.; once (*Mon.* III, 12, l. 11) he uses it with *quod* and subj.; this appears to be the only instance of his use of it with subj. alone.

[4] For this use of *vestrum*, cf. Ovid, *Fast.* IV, 889: 'Nulla mora est operae—vestrum est dare, vincere nostrum.'

[5] MS. *cam̄*, i.e. *causam*, for which Witte and all subsequent editors read *causa* (in MSS. *cā*). I think it more probable that *cam̄* is a mistake for *tam̄* (*c* and *t* are very easily confounded in MSS.), i.e. *tantum*, in the sense of *tam* (cf. *Epist.* IX, 33: 'temeraria tantum'; and see Du Cange, s.v., where he quotes 'tantum lividum' as an instance of 'tantum pro tam'); and that the meaningless *cū* (i.e. *cum*) of the MS. before *fuistis* is a mistake for *cā*, i.e. *causa*.

[6] The genitive *eclipseos*, which is substituted for the MS. reading *eclipsis* by all the editors except Muzzi, is non-existent in Latin. The regular genitive both in late and in mediaeval Latin was *eclipsis*, which is the only form registered by Giovanni da Genova, whereas he gives the alternative genitives '*-is* vel *-eos*' for other words of Greek origin in *-is*; e.g. *genesis*, *heresis*, *metamorphosis*, *syntaxis*.

[7] MS. *cū*, i.e. *cum* (see note 5 above). This emendation restores the cursus, giving the *planus*: caúsa fuístis.

[8] It seems probable that *degradati*, not *degratiati*, is the correct emendation of the MS. *degrattati*. *Disgratia* and *disgratiatus* are registered by Du Cange, but I can find no instance of *degratiatus*. On the other hand, *degradare* and *degradatio* ('poena ecclesiastica, qua quis suo gradu privatur') are recognised terms, and eminently applicable to the case in point, viz. degradation from the cardinalate.

[9] As is pointed out above (p. 214, n. 24), the abbreviation in the MS. might stand for *populo*, *proprio*, or *propositio*; but the first alone makes sense in this passage.

[10] I am indebted to Dr Heberden for pointing out that the MS. reading of this passage (except for the blunder of *quod* for *qui*) stands in need of no emendation, Dante evidently having had in mind 2 *Peter* iii. 7 (in the Vulgate): 'Coeli autem qui nunc sunt, et terra... igni reservati in diem judicii.'

l. 181. *For* civitate peregrinantium *read* civitate peregrinante (*MS.* peregrinate).

Text of Epist. VIII as provisionally emended[1].

[Cardinalibus Italicis Dantes de Florentia, etc.[2]]

[§ 1.] 'Quomodo sola sedet civitas, plena (2) populo! facta est quasi vidua domina (3) gentium.' Principum quondam Pha-(4)-risaeorum cupiditas, quae sacerdotium (5) vetus abominabile fecit, non modo Levi-(6)-ticae prolis ministerium transtulit, quin et (7) praeelectae civitati David obsidionem (8) peperit et ruinam. Quod quidem de (9) specula punctali[3] aeternitatis intuens (10) Qui solus aeternus est, mentem Deo (11) dignam viri prophetici per Spiritum (12) Sanctum sua iussione impressit, et (13) sanctam Ierusalem velut exstinctam, per (14) verba praesignata, et nimium, proh (15) dolor! iterata, deflevit.

[§ 2.] (16) Nos quoque, eundem[4] Patrem et (17) Filium, eundem Deum et hominem, nec (18) non eandem Matrem et Virginem profi-(19)-tentes, propter quos et propter quorum (20) salutem ter de caritate interrogatum et dic-(21)-tum est[5]: 'Petre, pasce oves meas,' scilicet sacrosanctum (22) ovile, Romam[6] (cui post tot triumphorum (23) pompas, et verbo et opere Christus orbis (24) confirmavit imperium, quam etiam ille (25) Petrus, et Paulus gentium praedicator, (26) in Apostolicam sedem aspergine proprii[7] (27) sanguinis consecrarunt[8]), cum (28) Ieremia, non lugenda postvenientes, sed (29) post ipsa[9] dolentes, viduam et desertam[10] (30) lugere compellimur.

[§ 3.][11] Piget, heu! non (31) minus quam plagam lamentabilem cer-(32)-nere haeresium, (33) quod[12] impietatis fautores, Iudaei, Saraceni, (34) et gentes[13] sabbata nostra rident, et, ut (35) fertur, conclamant: 'Ubi est Deus (36) eorum?' et quod forsan suis insidiis apos-(37)-tatae Potestates[14] contra defensantes Angelos hoc (38) adscribunt: et, quod horribilius est, quod (39) astronomi[15] quidam et crude prophetantes (40) necessarium asserunt, quod, male usi (41) libertate arbitrii, eligere maluistis.

---

[1] For convenience of reference the numbering of the sections [in square brackets] and of the lines (in round brackets) of the text as printed in the *Oxford Dante* have been inserted in the emended text.

[2] This heading obviously does not form part of the original letter.

[3] MS. *puctalis.*

[4] MS. *idem.*

[5] MS. *interogatum dictum est.*

[6] MS. *petre pasce sacrosanctam ovilem romanam.*

[7] MS. *propij.*

[8] MS. *consecrauit.*

[9] MS. *ipso.*

[10] MS. *disertam.*

[11] The reconstruction of the text makes it necessary to begin § 3 here, instead of at l. 33 as in the Oxford text.

[12] Supplied conjecturally.

[13] MS. *egentes.*

[14] MS. *apotestate potentes* (see p. 216, nn. 3, 4).

[15] MS. *astronomij.*

[§ 4.] (42). Vos equidem, ecclesiae militantis (43) veluti primi praepositi pili, per mani-(44)-festam orbitam Crucifixi currum[1] Sponsae (45) regere negligentes, non aliter quam falsus (46) auriga Phaeton exorbitastis; et, quorum (47) sequentem gregem per saltus peregrina-(48)-tionis huius illustrare intererat, ipsum (49) una vobiscum[2] ad praecipitium traduxistis. (50) Nec adimitanda vobis[3] recenseo, (51) quum dorsa, non vultus, ad Sponsae (52) vehiculum habeatis—vere dici pos-(53)-setis, qui prophetae ostensi sunt, male (54) versi ad templum—; vobis[4] ignem de coelo (55) missum despicientibus, ubi nunc arae ab (56) alieno calescunt; vobis columbas in tem-(57)-plo vendentibus, ubi quae[5] pretio men-(58)-surari non possunt, in detrimentum hinc (59) inde commorantium[6], venalia facta sunt. (60) Sed attendatis ad funiculum, attendatis (61) ad ignem! neque patientiam contemnatis (62) Illius, qui ad poenitentiam vos expectat. (63) Quod si de praelibato praecipitio dubi-(64)-tatur, quid aliud declarando respondeam, (65) nisi quod in Alcimum cum Demetrio (66) consensistis?

[§ 5.] (67) Forsitan, 'et quis iste, qui Ozae re-(68)-pentinum supplicium non formidans, ad (69) arcam, quamvis labantem, se erigit?' (70) indignanter obiurgabitis. Quippe de (71) ovibus in[7] pascuis Iesu Christi minima una (72) sum; quippe nulla pastorali auctoritate (73) abutens, quoniam divitiae mecum non (74) sunt. Non ergo divitiarum, sed gratia (75) Dei sum id quod sum, et 'zelus domus (76) eius comedit me[8].' Nam etiam in ore (77) lactentium et infantium sonuit iam Deo (78) placita[9] veritas, et caecus natus veritatem (79) confessus est, quam Pharisæi non modo (80) tacebant, sed et maligne reflectere cona-(81)-bantur. His habeo persuasum quod audeo. (82) Habeo praeter haec praeceptorem Philoso-(83)-phum, qui cuncta moralia dogmatizans, (84) amicis omnibus veritatem docuit praefe-(85)-rendam. Nec Ozae praesumptio, quam (86) obiectandam quis crederet quasi temere (87) prorumpentem me inficit sui tabe reatus; (88) quia ille ad arcam, ego ad boves calci-(89)-trantes per abvia distrahentes, attendo[10]. (90) Ille ad arcam proficiat, qui salutiferos (91) oculos ad naviculam fluctuantem aperuit!

[§ 6.] (92) Non itaque videor quemquam exa-(93)-cerbasse ad iurgia; quin potius confu-(94)-sionis ruborem et in vobis et aliis, (95) nomine solo archimandritis (per orbem (96) duntaxat pudor eradicatus non sit tota-(97)-liter) accendisse, quum de tot pastoris (98) officium usurpantibus, de tot ovibus, et (99) si non abactis, neglectis tamen et in-(100)-custoditis in pascuis, una sola vox, sola (101) pia, et haec privata, in matris Ecclesiae (102) quasi funere audiatur.

---

[1] MS. *cursum*.
[2] MS. *nobiscum*.
[3] Supplied conjecturally.
[4] MS. *Nobis*.
[5] MS. *ubique*.
[6] MS. *communancium*.
[7] Supplied conjecturally.
[8] Supplied conjecturally.
[9] MS. *placida*.
[10] MS. *actendor*.

[§ 7.] (103) Quidni? Cupiditatem unusquisque (104) sibi duxit uxorem[1], quemadmodum et (105) vos, quae nunquam pietatis et aequitatis, (106) ut caritas, sed semper impietatis et ini-(107)-quitatis est genetrix. Ha! mater piissima, (108) sponsa Christi, quae in aqua et spiritu (109) generas tibi filios ad ruborem! Non (110) caritas, non Astraea, sed filiae sangui-(111)-sugae factae sunt tibi nurus. Quae quales (112) pariant tibi foetus, praeter Lunensem (113) pontificem, omnes alii contestantur. (114) Iacet Gregorius tuus in telis aranearum, (115) iacet Ambrosius in neglectis clericorum (116) latibulis, iacet Augustinus adiectus, (117) Dionysius, Damascenus et Beda; et (118) nescio quod *Speculum*, Innocentium, et (119) Ostiensem declamant. Cur non? Illi (120) Deum quaerebant, ut finem et optimum; (121) isti census et beneficia consequuntur.

[§ 8.] (122) Sed, o Patres, ne me phoenicem (123) extimetis in orbe[2] terrarum. Omnes enim (124) quae garrio, murmurant, aut mussant, aut cogitant, (125) aut somniant; et quae inventa non attes-(126)-tantur. Nonnulli sunt in admiratione (127) suspensi: an semper et hoc silebunt, neque (128) Factori suo testimonium reddent? Vivit (129) Dominus, quia qui movit linguam in asina[3] (130) Balaam, Dominus est etiam modernorum (131) brutorum.

[§ 9.] (132) Iam garrulus factus sum: vos me (133) coegistis. Pudeat ergo tam ab infra, non (134) de coelo ut vos absolvat[4], argui vel moneri. (135) Recte quidem nobiscum agitur[5], quum ex ea (136) parte pulsatur ad nos ad quam cum (137) caeteris sensibus inflet auditum, ac pariat (138) pudor in nobis poenitudinem, primogeni-(139)-tam suam, et haec[6] propositum emenda-(140)-tionis aggeneret.

[§ 10.] (141) Quod ut gloriosa longanimitas (142) foveat et defendat, Romam urbem, nunc (143) utroque lumine destitutam, nunc Hanni-(144)-bali nedum alii miserandam, solam se-(145)-dentem et viduam, prout superius pro-(146)-clamatur, qualis est, pro modulo vestrae (147) imaginis ante mentales oculos[7] affigatis (148) oportet. Et ad vos haec sunt maxime, (149) qui sacrum Tiberim[1] parvuli cognovistis. (150) Nam etsi Latiale caput pie cunctis est (151) Italis diligendum, tamquam commune (152) suae civilitatis principium, vestrum[2] iuste (153) censetur accuratissime colere ipsum, quum (154) sit vobis principium ipsius quoque esse[3]. (155) Et si caeteros Italos in praesens miseria (156) dolore confecit et rubore confudit; erubes-(157)-cendum esse vobis, dolendum quis (158) dubitet, qui tantum[4] insolitae sui vel solis (159) eclipsis causa[5] fuistis? Tu[6] prae omnibus, Urse, (160) ne degradati[7] collegae populo rema-(161)-nerent inglorii; et illi, ut militantis (162) Ecclesiae veneranda insignia, quae forsan (163) non emeriti[8] sed immeriti coacti[9] posu-(164)-erant, Apostolici Culminis auctoritate (165) resumerent[10]. Tu quoque, Transtiberinae (166) sectator[11] factionis[12] alterius, ut ira defuncti (167) Antistitis in te velut ramus insitionis (168) in trunco non suo frondesceret, quasi[13] (169) triumphatam Carthaginem nondum ex-(170)-ueras, illustrium Scipionum patriae (171) potuisti hunc animum sine ulla tui iu-(172)-dicii contradictione praeferre?

---

[1] MS. *duxit in uxorem* (see p. 217, n. 2).

[2] MS. *orbem.*

[3] MS. *asinam.*

[4] MS. *ut absoluet* (see p. 217, n. 5).

[5] MS. *agit* (see p. 217, n. 6).

[6] MS. *hoc*; the difference in MSS. between *hoc* (*h̄*) and *hec* (*h̄*) is almost infinitesimal.

[7] MS. *oculo.*

[§ 11.] (173) Emendabitur quidem (quamquam (174) non sit quin nota cicatrix infamis (175) Apostolicam Sedem, usque ad ignem (176) cui coeli qui[14] nunc sunt et terra sunt reservati, deturpet), (177) si[15] unanimes omnes qui huiusmodi ex-(178)-orbitationis fuistis auctores, pro Sponsa (179) Christi, pro sede Sponsae, quae Roma est, (180) pro Italia nostra, et ut plenius dicam, (181) pro tota civitate peregrinante[16] in terris, (182) viriliter propugnetis[17], ut de palaestra iam (183) coepti certaminis, undique ab Oceani (184) margine circumspecta[18], vosmetipsos cum (185) gloria offerentes, audire possitis: 'Gloria (186) in excelsis'; et ut Vasconum opprobrium, (187) qui tam dira cupidine conflagrantes

---

[1] MS. *tybrum.*

[2] MS. *uestra.*

[3] MS. *cum sit vobis principium civilitatis esse ipsum quoque*; but it is difficult to believe that Dante can have written such a sentence, which is moreover impossible from the point of view of the cursus. It is no doubt a case of 'pie,' as to which see Moore, *Studies in Dante*, IV, 6, 33. Moore shows how easily a confused sentence like the above may arise—words accidentally omitted by a primitive copyist, and by him (or another) written in the margin, subsequently get inserted in the text, but in the wrong place. The process is analogous to that by which marginal glosses become embodied in the text. The omission of *civilitatis* (which apparently was caught by the copyist from the preceding line) and the substitution of *ipsius* for *ipsum*, are due to Witte the first editor of the letter. It may be noted that the phrase *ipsius esse*, in the genitive, occurs in *Epist.* x, 398.

[4] MS. *causam* (*cūm*) (see p. 218, n. 5).

[5] MS. *cum* (*cū*) (see p. 218, n. 7).

[6] MS. *tum* (*tū*).

[7] MS. *degrattati.*

[8] MS. *emerit.*

[9] MS. *cuncti* (*cūti*).

[10] MS. *resumeret.*

[11] MS. *septator.*

[12] MS. *sanctionis.*

[13] MS. *Quod si.*

[14] MS. *quod.*

[15] MS. *Sin.*

[16] MS. *peregrinate.*

[17] MS. *propungniatis.*

[18] Dr Moore suggested to me some years ago (see his *Studies in Dante*, iii. 114, n. 5) that the real reading here may be *circumsepta*, as Dante's words seem to be an echo of the phrase of Orosius: 'orbem totius terrae, oceani limbo circumseptum' (I, 2, § 1); but I have not ventured to introduce *circumsepta* into the text.

(188) Latinorum gloriam sibi usurpare con-(189)-tendunt, per[1] saecula cuncta futura sit (190) posteris in exemplum.

Provisional Translation.

[To the Italian Cardinals Dante of Florence, etc.]

[§ 1.] 'How doth the city sit solitary that was full of people! She is become as a widow that was great among the nations[2]'. The greed aforetime of the chiefs of the Pharisees, which made the ancient priesthood an abomination, not only did away the ministry of the children of Levi, but moreover brought siege and destruction on the chosen city of David. And when He, who alone is eternal, beheld this thing from his eternal watchtower on high, by his Holy Spirit He laid his command upon the mind worthy of God of a man that was a prophet, and in the words above written, alas! too often repeated, lamented over holy Jerusalem as a city undone.

[§ 2.] We too who confess the same Father and Son, the same God and Man, yea, the same Mother and Virgin, we for whose sake and for whose salvation thrice was the question repeated concerning love and it was said: 'Peter, feed my sheep'[3], that is to say the sacred fold, Rome, to which, after so many triumphs and glories, Christ by word and deed confirmed the empire of the world, that Rome which the same Peter, and Paul the preacher to the Gentiles, by the sprinkling of their own blood consecrated as the Apostolic See, over her, widowed and abandoned, we, who come not after the woes we have to bewail, but now mourn in consequence of them[4], are, like Jeremiah, constrained to lament.

[§ 3.] It grieves us, alas! no less to witness the lamentable plague of heresies, than that the fomenters of impiety, Jews, Saracens, and Gentiles, make a mock of our Sabbaths[5], and as is said, cry out 'Where is their God?[6]' and that perchance the renegade Powers ascribe this to their own wiles against the protecting Angels[7]. And, more horrible still, certain readers of the stars and ignorant prophets declare that to be of necessity, which you, making ill use of your freedom of will, have preferred of your own choice.

[§ 4.] But you, who are as it were the centurions of the front rank of the Church militant, neglecting to guide the chariot of the Spouse of the Crucified along the track which lay before you, have gone astray from the track, no otherwise than as the false charioteer Phaethon[1]. And you, whose duty it was to enlighten the flock that follows you through the forest on its pilgrimage here below, have brought it along with yourselves to the verge of the precipice. Nor do I recount examples for your imitation, seeing that you turn your backs, not your faces, to the car of the Spouse, and verily might be likened to them that were shown to the prophet with their backs turned towards the temple[2]; you who scorn the fire sent down from heaven upon the altars, which now are alight with strange fire[3]; you who sell doves in the temple[4] where that which cannot be measured by price is made merchandise to the hurt of them that come and go therein. But give heed to the scourge[5], give heed to the fire[6]; and make not light of the patience of Him who awaits your repentance. But if you doubt as to the precipice whereof I have spoken, what else can I answer to enlighten you but that like Demetrius you have consented unto Alcimus[7]?

---

[1] MS. *pro.*

[2] *Lam.* i, 1.

[3] *John* xxi, 15—17.

[4] That is, we have to grieve, not for past, but for present woes.

[5] *Lam.* i, 7.

[6] *Psalm* lxxviii, 10.

[7] Cf. *Ephes.* vi, 11—12.

[§ 5.] Perchance in indignant rebuke you will ask: 'And who is this man who, not fearing the sudden punishment of Uzzah[8], sets himself up to protect the Ark, tottering though it be?' Verily I am one of the least of the sheep of the pasture of Jesus Christ; verily I abuse no pastoral authority, seeing that I possess no riches. By the grace, therefore, not of riches, but of God, I am what I am[9], and the zeal of His house hath eaten me up[10]. For even from the mouth of babes and sucklings has been heard the truth[11] well pleasing to God; and he who was born blind confessed the truth, which the Pharisees not only concealed, but in their malice even strove to pervert[12]. These are the justification for my boldness. And besides these I have the authority of the Philosopher, who in his system of morals taught that truth is to be preferred even before friendship[13]. Nor does the presumption of Uzzah, which some may think should be laid to my charge, infect me, as though I had been rash in my utterance, with the taint of his guilt. For he gave heed to the Ark, I to the unruly oxen that are dragging it away into the wilderness. May He give succour to the Ark, who opened his eyes to bring salvation to the labouring ship![14]

---

[1] Cf. *Inf.* xvii, 107; *Purg.* iv, 72; xxix, 118—20; *Par.* xvii, 3; xxxi, 125; *Conv.* ii, 15, ll. 53 ff.

[2] *Ezek.* viii, 16.

[3] *Levit.* x, 1.

[4] *John* ii, 14—15.

[5] *John* ii, 15 ('flagellum de funiculis').

[6] *Levit.* x, 2; *Numb.* xvi, 35.

[7] 1 *Macc.* vii, 9 (with allusion to Philip IV of France and Clement V).

[8] 2 *Sam.* vi, 6—7.

[9] 1 *Cor.* xv, 10.

[10] *Psalm* lxviii, 10.

[11] *Psalm* viii, 3.

[12] *John* ix, 1—41.

[13] *Ethics* i, vi, 1; cf. *Mon.* iii, 1, ll. 17—18.

[14] *Matt.* viii, 24—6; *Mark* iv, 36—9; *Luke* viii, 22—5.

[§ 6.] It seems then that I have provoked no one to railing; but rather that I have kindled the blush of confusion in you and in others, chief-priests in name only (if so be that shame has not been wholly rooted out throughout the world), since among so many who usurp the office of shepherd, among so many sheep who, if not driven away, at least are neglected and left untended in the pastures, one voice alone, one alone of lamentation, and that of a private individual, is heard at the obsequies as it were of Mother Church.

[§ 7.] And what wonder? Each one has taken avarice to wife, even as you yourselves have done; avarice, the mother never of piety and righteousness, but ever of impiety and unrighteousness. Ah! most loving Mother, Spouse of Christ, that by water and the spirit[1] bearest sons unto thy shame! Not charity, not Astraea[2], but the daughters of the horseleech[3] have become thy daughters-in-law. And what offspring they bear thee all save the Bishop of Luni bear witness. Your Gregory lies among the cobwebs; Ambrose lies forgotten in the cupboards of the clergy, and Augustine along with him; and Dionysius, Damascenus, and Bede; and they cry up instead I know not what *Speculum*, and Innocent, and him of Ostia. And why not? Those sought after God as their end and highest good; these get for themselves riches and benefices.

[§ 8.] But, my Fathers, suppose not that I am a phœnix in the wide world. For every one is murmuring, or muttering, or thinking, or dreaming, what I cry aloud; but they do not testify to what they have seen. Some there are who remain lost in wonder; but will they for ever hold their peace, nor bear witness to their Maker? The Lord liveth, for He who moved the tongue of Balaam's ass[4], He is the Lord also of the brutes of to day.

[§ 9.] Now am I constrained to lift up my voice: ye have compelled me[5]. Be ye therefore ashamed to receive rebuke and admonishment from so lowly a source, and not from Heaven, which may pardon you. In the right fashion indeed are we dealt with when we are smitten on that side by which shame can reach our hearing as well as the rest of our senses, and beget in us repentance, her first-born, who in turn shall give birth to purpose of amendment.

[§ 10.] And that a glorious patience may foster and maintain this purpose, it behoves you to keep before the eyes of your mind, according to the measure of your imagination, the present condition of the city of Rome, a sight to move the pity even of Hannibal, not to say others, bereft as she now is of the one and the other of her luminaries, and sitting solitary and widowed, as is written above. And this most chiefly is your concern, who have known sacred Tiber as little children. For although it is the duty of all Italians to love the capital of Italy as the common source of their civility, yet is it justly held to be your part most especially to reverence it, since for you it is the source also of your very being[1]. And if at the present time misery has consumed with grief and confounded with shame the rest of the inhabitants of Italy, who can doubt but that you must blush with shame, and must grieve, who have been the cause of so unwonted an eclipse of Rome or rather of her Sun[2]? Thou above all, Orsini, that thy colleagues who have been degraded should not continue stripped of their glory in the eyes of the people; and they, that by the authority of the Apostolic Head[3] they should resume the venerable insignia of the Church Militant[4], which, not as perchance having completed their service, but undeservedly, they were compelled to lay down. Thou also, the adherent of the other Transteverine faction, in order that the wrath of the deceased pontiff might put forth leaves in thee, like a branch engrafted on a trunk not its own, as if thou hadst not yet put off the Carthage that was conquered of old[5], couldst thou, without the reproof of thy better judgment, prefer this purpose before the country of the illustrious Scipios?

---

[1] *John* iii, 5.

[2] Cf. *Mon.* I, 11, ll. 7—8: 'Virgo vocabatur Justitia, quam etiam Astraeam vocabant'; also *Purg.* XXII, 71; and *Epist.* VII, 23.

[3] *Prov.* xxx, 15.

[4] *Numb.* xxii, 28—30.

[5] 2 *Cor.* xii, 11.

[§ 11.] There will be amendment, however (although it cannot be but that the scar of infamy will disfigure with its mark the Apostolic See even until the fire for which the heavens that now are and the earth have been reserved[6]), if you all, who were the authors of this deviation from the track, with one accord shall fight manfully for the Spouse of Christ, for the seat of the Spouse, which is Rome, for our Italy, and, to speak more at large, for the whole body politic now in pilgrimage on earth, so that from the wrestling-ground (surveyed on every side from the shores of ocean) of the contest that is already begun, offering yourselves with glory, you may be able to hear 'Glory in the highest[1],' and that the reproach of the Gascons, who, burning with abominable lust, strive to usurp for themselves the glory of the Italians, may be an example to posterity for all ages to come.

---

[1] If Rome did not exist, you as Cardinals would have no existence.

[2] The removal of the Apostolic See to Avignon was an eclipse not so much of Rome, as of the Papacy itself (figured by the Sun, the greater light; cf. *Mon.* III, 4, ll. 10—21; *Epist.* v, 169—70; *Epist.* VI, 54—5).

[3] 'Culmen'—cf. 'vestrum Culmen' in the second Battifolle letter (see *M.L.R.* XII, 303 n. 5).

[4] 'Militantis Ecclesiae veneranda insignia,' cf. *Epist.* VII, 16—17: 'veneranda signa Tarpeia' (of the Imperial ensign).

[5] That is, wert at heart a foe to Rome, Carthage having been the secular enemy of Rome.

[6] 2 *Pet.* iii, 7.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.
6 *August*, 1917.

---

[1] *Luke* xix, 38.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

A Devotion to the Cross written in the South-west of England.

In MS. Bodley 177, on the back of leaf 61, is written, in a rough late-fourteenth-century hand, an instruction for a devotion in connexion with the Holy Cross. It is arranged on either side of, and below, the shaft of a tau cross, the horizontal beam of which extends across the top of it. The piece is of interest both to the linguist and the ecclesiologist. It can fortunately be definitely assigned to its locality; firstly, from its containing the form *dunder* (= *thunder*), which is peculiar to Cornwall, Devon, and Somerset, but has not hitherto been recorded before the seventeenth century; secondly—as is pointed out in the Bodleian Summary Catalogue, no. 2072—from the invocation of SS. Cyricus and Julitta, whose cultus is indicated to belong to the south-west by the fact that the dedication of churches in their honour is restricted to this area.

It will be seen that the syntax of the English part is very loose. The Latin formula, which consists of a rhymed anthem addressed to the saints invoked, the versicle 'Preciosa est in conspectu Domini' with the response 'Mors sanctorum eius,' and a prayer in collect form, I have been unable to trace elsewhere; it was probably composed specially for the occasion.

Along the beam of the cross, between nails (rubricated), one at either end, is the legend 'In no*min*e xp̄i Jhū signo me,' which is continued down the shaft by 'hoc signo Tau,' disposed, in the midst of symbols, thus: a cross, hoc, a heart, signo, a cross, Ta, a cross, v, a nail, a cross. The text is as follows (upright strokes mark the ends of lines):

[On the left hand of the tau cross facing the reader]

Thys crosse xv. tymes metyng ys þe | length of owre lorde cryst jhū ande | what ma*n* woma*n* or chylde þat daye | lokyng hyt a pou*n* or bles hym þer w^{t} | shal no ma*n* ne woma*n* ne wykked | spryt haue pouer þe to hurt ne | dunder ne lyȝtnyng slepyng nor | wakyng on londe nor on see no*þer* | yn wynde no*þer* in blastes shal neu*er* | harme the nor yn batell be ouer|come no*þer* dey of no wonde noþer | of no stroke w^{t} owte *con*fession ne | dey no shameful deth nor dey | yn p*er*ell of fyr*e* ne wat*er* & yf ye | be in dedely syn*e* ye shal neu*er* dy | *þer* in w^{t} owte shreft ne howsell | ffor seynt Ciricie and*e* seynt Ju|lytt hys moder desyred thys gyft | of god whyche was grawntyd them | Ande thys lett*es* al man*er* harmes | & poysons thorow þe v*er*tu of thes |

[On the right hand of the cross]

seyntes hyt shall deliu*er* yowe & | breke y^r enmyes power And encrese | y^u in worldely goodes Ande yff a | woma*n* tr*a*ueyle on chylde ley thys | a pou*n* hyr & she shal be deliu*er*ed | & þe chylde to haue crystendame | & þe mod*er* haue puryficac*i*oun | Salue decus p*ar*uulor*um* Miles regis | angelor*um* O cirice cum beata genetr*ice* | tua julitta xp̄s et maria nos | saluet mortis in hora Amen. | Preciosa est in *con*spectu d*omi*ni. Mors s*anc*tor*um* ei*us* | De*us* q*ui* gloriosis tuis martiri*bus* | Cirico et Julitte tr*i*buisti dira ne|phandi judicis torme*n*ta sup*er*are | tr*i*bue m*ih*i fam|ulo tuo .N. humili|tatem et v*er*itatem gloriose longitudi|nis tue et ven*er*abilis cruc*is* tue | p*re*ciose corporis et sanguinis tui | et p*er* om*n*ipotencias et virtutes |

[At the bottom of the cross, right across the leaf]

tuas et p*er* intercessione*m* s*anc*tor*um* tuo*rum* concedas m*ih*i triu*m*phu*m* omniu*m* i*n*imicor*um* | meo*rum* et vt possim semp*er* retinere *con*stantiam p*er* xpm̄ d*omi*num nostru*m*. | Amen.

The whole of the English part of the text is underlined in red, as is also—evidently in error—the left half of the first line of Latin below the cross; *saluet mortis in hora Amen* has also a red underline. Some initials, the symbols on the cross, and the final 'Amen' are splashed with red.

Thys crosse xv. tymes metyng ys þe length of owre lorde. The length of the cross as drawn in the MS., including the nails projecting above the beam, is 5 inches; 15 times this is 75 inches, or 6 ft. 3 in., the traditional height of Christ. In a list of 'the longitudes of men' printed from Lambeth MS. 306, fol. 117 (temp. Edward IV) in *Reliquiæ Antiquæ*, vol. i, p. 200, next to Moses, is given 'Cryste vj. fote and iij. ynches.'

Professor Craigie refers me to a document of about 1300 printed in *Alfræði Íslenzk*, III. *Landalýsingar*, 1. hæfte, p. 65, where a straight line is given which is stated to be one-sixteenth of the length of our Lord; in the reproduction it measures 4⅛ in., but the editor (Kr. Kålund) omits to state whether this is the actual size of the original; the Latin and Icelandic text indicates that the line is to be used for a devotional purpose similar to that described in our MS.

wykked. MS. *wylked* (?).

dunder. This form needs to be added to the example *disl* (= *thistle*), of initial þ > d, given in Prof. Wright's *Dialect Grammar*, § 310. The local distribution seems to make it certain that it is a different word from *dunder* meaning to rumble.

seynt Ciricie ande seynt Julytt hys moder. SS. Cyricus and Julitta were a young boy and his mother who suffered under the persecution of Diocletian. The following dedications of churches in their name are given in Frances Arnold-Foster's *Studies in Church Dedications*

SS. Cyricus and Julitta at Luxulyan and St Veep in Cornwall, SS. Quiricus and Julietta at Tickenham in Somersetshire.

tuis martiribus. Above these words are written respectively b, a, to indicate transposition.

tormenta. The mark of contraction for *n* is wrongly placed over the *m*.

longitudinis tue, i.e. the stature of Christ.

preciose. ? Read *preciosi.*

C. T. ONIONS.

OXFORD.

WALTHER VON DER VOGELWEIDE, 67, 32 (LACHMANN) (PAUL 92, 40).

Ich hât ein schœnez bilde erkorn,
und owê daz ichz ie gesach
ald ie sô vil zuoz ime gesprach!
ez hât schœn unde rede verlorn.
dâ wonte ein wunder inne: daz fuor ine weiz war:
dâ von gesweic daz bilde iesâ.
sîn liljerôsevarwe wart sô karkelvar,
daz ez verlôs smac unde schîn.
'mîn bilde, ob ich bekerkelt bin
in dir, so lâ mich ûz alsô
daz wir ein ander vinden frô:
wan ich muoz aber wider in.'

W. Wilmanns, *Walther von der Vogelweide*^{2} (1883), p. 276, says: 'In dieser Strophe ist weder von der Geliebten Walthers die Rede (Rieger [*Leben Walthers*] S. 77), noch von der Frau Welt (Pfeiffer [Ausgabe^{2} S. 148]), sondern die Seele redet zum Leibe....' Subsequent editions[1], e.g. F. Pfaff's in Kürschner's *Deutsche National-Litteratur* 8, 2, p. 142, and monographs on Walther, e.g. A. Schönbach, *Walther von der Vogelweide*^{2}, p. 195, accept this view; but Rieger, in reverting to his previous opinion in an article in the *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, vol. 46 (1902), pp. 181–85, does not find it difficult to refute Wilmanns' view and, at the same time, that of Pfeiffer or rather R. Hildebrand, who, in the meantime, had tried to prove (*Zeitschrift f. d. Altertum*, vol. 38 (1894), pp. 10–14) that the *bilde* which Walther is addressing here is the *Welt*, i.e. the poet's audience, the courtly society. Rieger's arguments, which might be added to, are quite convincing, and a reference to his article will suffice. But the constructive part of Rieger's article is less fortunate. Not many will, I think, agree with him when he tells us (p. 185): 'mit dem jetzt entseelten, einst schönen Bilde (v. 1–8) meint der Dichter eine als Leiche wiedergesehene, einst von ihm geliebte und besungene Schöne,' and p. 184: 'wol wird er [Walther] es sein, der in den letzten vier Versen sich mit seiner Seele als seinem wesentlichen Teil gleichsetzend in ihrem Namen den Leib anredet.' Two entirely different images in these twelve lines, the first not only far-fetched, but repulsive in its callousness! And matters do not improve when Rieger states that the poet indicated the transition from the first to the second image by a rhetorical emphasis on the possessive pronoun *mîn* (l. 9) which stands in a rhythmically unstressed *Auftakt*-syllable. Indeed, if such were the solution of the 'riddle,' even the shrewdest among Walther's audience might have failed to solve it. Under these circumstances a new attempt to arrive at a conclusion may not be unwelcome.

---

[1] The new edition of Wilmanns' *Walther* by H. Michel (1916) is not accessible at present on account of the war.

The heart naturally plays an important part in the Minnesang. One particular way of introducing it claims our attention here. When the knightly Minnesinger crosses the Alps, it is only his body which he places at the king's service: his heart remains with his lady whose heart he may, however, ask for as a fair exchange. So Hohenburc, *HMS*, I, 34^b. Liningen, on the other hand, carries with him two hearts, for, says his lady-love: 'Sît daz dîn vart unwendic ist, | so füerst in arebeite | zwei herze, dez mîne und dîne, hin, | dâ von ich iemer trûric bin: | nû sî Krist dîn geleite' (Bartsch, *Deutsche Liederdichter*, p. 176_{51}). Again, when Friedrich von Husen goes to the crusade (1189), he sings, borrowing from Conon de Béthune: 'vert der lîp in enelende, mîn herze belîbet doch aldâ' (*MSF*, 51_{29}); and in another place (47_9):

Mîn herze und mîn lîp diu wellent scheiden
diu mit einander varnt nu manige zît.
der lîp wil gerne vehten an die heiden:
sô hât iedoch daz herze erwelt ein wîp
vor al der werlt. daz müet mich iemer sît,
daz si ein ander niene volgent beide....

and

Sît ich dich, herze, niht wol mac erwenden,
dun wellest mich vil trûreclîchen lân,
sô bite ich got daz er dich ruoche senden
an eine stat dâ man dich wol enpfâ.
owê wie sol ez armen dir ergân!
wie torstest eine an solhe nôt ernenden?...

While these metaphors[1] show that the heart was regarded as being to a certain extent independent of the body within which it is confined, this self-determined life of the heart within the body and, at the same time, the subservience of both heart and body to the third constituent of man[1]—the soul—is clearly seen in the so-called *Erste Büchlein* of Hartmann von Aue, an impeachment of the heart by the body ending with their reconciliation. The following quotations from one of the harangues of the body to the heart show the relation of the three components (Ed. Haupt, 1881², l. 1020):

---

[1] Cf. A. Lüderitz, *Die Liebestheorie der Provençalen bei den Minnesingern der Staufenzeit*, Berlin (1904), pp. 97–101. For Walther cf. Burdach, *Reinmar und Walther*, p. 145 (also p. 26. 36) and 98_6: 'Nu bin ich iedoch | frô und muoz bî fröiden mîn | durch die

> von diu lâzen wirz durch got
> unde gedenken dar an
> daz wir beide (*body + heart*) sîn ein man.
> nû zwiu solt ich âne dich
> od waz möhtst dû âne mich?
> . . . .
> 1029 bist dû mir guot, sam bin ich dir,
> wan ân ein ander mugen wir
> deheine wîle genesen:
> wir müezen immer sament wesen.
> wir mugen uns niht gescheiden.
> got der hât uns beiden
> eine sêle gegeben
> (anders möht wir niht geleben),
> die nimet er uns swanne er wil:
> des haben wir kein gewizzez zil.

According to the conduct of body and heart in life, the soul, and they with it, will finally earn eternal reward or eternal punishment (ll. 1039–1060).

Walther knew Hartmann's poem. One of his songs shows an almost verbal agreement; cf. Walther, 14_{26}: 'daz ein wîp niht wizzen mac wer si meine' = H. v. 218 f.: 'daz ein wîp niht wizzen mac wer sî mit triuwen meinet'; and there are besides some rather close resemblances in thought, e.g. $14_{18\text{-}21}$: v. 207 ff. and $14_{30\text{-}31}$: v. 265 ff. It appears, therefore; possible that the triad-idea so clearly expressed here, pleased Walther and lingered in his mind; at any rate, I venture to suggest that the same conception stands behind verse 67_{32} and that the *Ich*, the speaker of these lines, is—the *heart*.

---

lieben, swiez dar under mir ergât. | mîn schîn ist hie noch: | sô ist ir daz herze mîn | bî, daz man mich ofte sinnelôsen hât. | hei solten si zesamene komen, | mîn lîp mîn herze ir beider sinne!...' Cf. the modern treatment of a similar idea in Eichendorff's poem *Der Entherzte* (Sämtliche Werke³ (1883), I. p. 203). For the cult of the heart in the period of sentimentality cf. Goethe's *Werther*, letter of May 13th.

[1] Cf. A. Schönbach, *Über Hartmann von Aue* (1894), pp. 168 f. He parallels this triad in the composition of men with the teaching of the church as seen, e.g., in the treatise *De unione corporis et spiritus* (Migne, tom. 177, c. 295), attributed to Hugo of St Victor: 'in unoquoque homine tria sunt: caro, spiritus et mens (caro = body, spiritus = cor, heart, mens = soul), ad carnem pertinet delectio, ad spiritum cogitatio, ad mentem discretio'; but is not the important part the heart played in the lyrical poetry of the time a sufficient explanation of this idea?

In an epic strain the heart bewails in the first eight lines the appalling change that has befallen its companion[1], its *bilde*, the body, since their partner, the *wunder*, the soul, has fled to an unknown destination ('ine weiz war'). Then, changing from the epic to the dramatic mood, it appeals to[2] and beseeches the body, its prison[3], to set it free until the time when they must come together again, the day of the last judgment, to receive, along with the soul, reward or doom.

In Walther's poem—a vision one might call it—the heart that speaks and the body addressed by it are, in the first instance, the human heart, the human body in general; but one likes to think that, at the same time, the aged poet—for the verse undoubtedly belongs to the end of his life—had in mind his own heart, the seat alike of his sorrows and joys, the source of his songs of love and passion; he could not bear to think of it lying with the body in the long night of the grave awaiting there the call of the recording angel[4].

The singular and ingenious form of this poem extends to four other poems. Lachmann did well to separate, in his edition, the first two from the rest as an independent poem. The last three, although each complete in itself, are parts of one and the same anxious outpouring of a saddened mind that feels the end to be near. 'I have renounced the world and its vain and false delights (67_8); oh that my soul might be saved! Its voice counsels me to forswear this world's *minne* for the only true *minne*, that of God! (67_{20}) oh, that my heart might not share the body's fate, until the day of judgment breaks!' (67_{32}) Such are the thoughts embedded in these lines, and they follow in logical order.

R. PRIEBSCH.

LONDON.

A NOTE ON THE TRAGIC 'ADMIRATIO.'

IN the recently published instalments of his article on *Lessing's Interpretation of Aristotle*[5] Professor Robertson has noted that Lessing, in his correspondence on the subject of tragedy with Nicolai and Mendelssohn[6], made a distinction between 'Bewunderung' and 'Verwunderung.'

---

[1] L. 3; we are again reminded of the situation behind Hartmann's poem.

[2] I note here the formal correspondence with the immediately preceding poem (67_{20}) the four last lines of which are, though the editors have not recognised it, certainly a direct speech of the soul to the body.

[3] The use of the doubting *ob* in l. 9 is very fine.

[4] The eternal life of the heart is the postulate of Lenau's fine poem *Mein Herz* (*Sämmtliche Werke*, 1855, I, p. 361).

[5] *Modern Language Review*, Vol. XII, p. 159. See also the section on 'admiration,' pp. 327—329.

[6] Ed. by R. Petsch, Leipzig, 1910, p. 63.

Mendelssohn agreed that there was a distinction[1], but maintained, a little pointedly perhaps[2], that not he, but Lessing, had failed to apply it properly. To explain why, in spite of Lessing, he admires a man in whom he discovers unexpected good qualities, which yet are grounded in his moral personality, he declares 'Verwunderung' to be a preliminary stage of 'Bewunderung.' When, for example, greatness unexpectedly discovered in a character is by later events shown to be a natural part of that character, surprise passes into admiration. Thus Mendelssohn admits 'Verwunderung' amongst the emotions aroused by tragedy, although only as a preparatory stage for 'Bewunderung.'

Mendelssohn's suggestion of a relationship between 'Bewunderung' and 'Verwunderung' is not without some plausibility[3]. In Latin translations of Aristotle's *Poetics*, it will be remembered, the term designating 'Verwunderung' would be 'admiratio,' a term which also happens to cover the meaning 'Bewunderung.' A perception of this fact, which seems to have been generally overlooked, has led naturally to an inquiry into the changing meaning of the Latin word and its uses in earlier stages of dramatic criticism.

The Latin word 'admiratio' may be translated either as (1) surprise, astonishment or as (2) admiration in the modern sense. It is quite evident that, although the element of surprise is almost indissolubly bound up with admiration in the usual modern sense, that element is now of very small importance. In Latin the surprise seems to have been almost as important as the respect and reverence[4] which now, with a hardly perceptible admixture of surprise, constitute almost solely the meaning of admiration. But since the word passed into French and English, as Littré or Hatzfeld-Darmesteter and the *New English Dictionary* plainly show, the element of surprise has steadily receded[5].

In Germany the word seems to have been used quite early in connection with tragedy by G. Fabricius, and quite plainly with the meaning of 'astonishment[1],' and, it should be noticed, perhaps as a substitute for pity in a katharsis-clause containing the words 'misericordia et horror.' That would already connect the 'admiratio' with Aristotle. There was, however, another link: surprise or astonishment is essentially dependent on action, on incidents, and Aristotle, it will be remembered, had noticed that the incidents arousing pity and fear 'have the greatest effect upon the mind when they occur unexpectedly and at the same time in consequence of one another[2]. The Italian Jesuit Alexander Donatus, whose *Ars Poetica* was popular in Germany in the seventeenth century[3], explains the 'admiratio' just in that spirit, seeing in it the result of the marvellous, the Aristotelian τὸ θαυμαστόν[4]. The main element of 'admiratio,' as Donatus conceives it, is surprise, but with an admixture of fear (indeed, it might almost be translated as 'awe'), resulting sometimes from what a modern critic would call tragic irony.

---

[1] Some time after he made this quite clear in the following passage: 'Verwundern und Bewundern sind im Deutschen von eben so verschiedener Bedeutung als im Lateinisch mirari und admirari. Man verwundert sich über eine Sache, die dem Laufe der Natur zuwider zu seyn scheint; man bewundert hingegen nur erhabene Dinge, an denen wir eine vorzügliche Vollkommenheit wahrnehmen.' *Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften* (1758), *Ges. Schriften*, Vol. IV, 1, pp. 438 ff.

[2] 'So verwundere ich mich über den Donner...und endlich über Sie, wenn Sie mir eine so fehlerhafte Distinktion einbilden wollen.' Petsch, p. 72.

[3] See e.g. Teichmüller's treatment of admiration: 1. Das logische Staunen. 2. Das Bewundern. *Aristotelische Forschungen*, Halle, 1869, Vol. II, pp. 282 ff.

[4] The two principal meanings, according to the *Thesaurus*, are (1) 'affectus reverentis vel venerantis'; (2) 'affectus obstupescentis.' Forcellini even puts the second first.

[5] Hatzfeld-Darmesteter gives 'étonnement' as 'vieilli'; the *N.E.D.* 'wonder,' 'astonishment,' 'surprise,' as 'archaic.'

Later German critics, although writing in the vernacular, preserved this sense of 'admiratio.' Thus e.g. Georg-Philipp Harsdörfer. However muddled his attempts at criticism, they show clearly that he was anxious to add the 'admiratio,' in the sense of 'Erstaunen,' to the emotions aroused by tragedy[5]. He conceives it as related to, but distinct from, fear and altogether subordinated to pity. In this he was followed by Klaj[6] who, in order to describe the complex new emotion, coined the new word 'Furchterstaunen'! Again, half a century later,

---

[1] In Seneca's tragedies, he declares 'excitantur ipsi ab inferis mortui, excitantur interdum Furiae... ; quae imago stans in Orchestra et admirationem et horrorem incutit' (*De tragoediarum usu*, prefixed to his edition of Seneca's tragedies, 1566).

[2] *Poetics*, Ch. IX, Bywater's translation. In Ch. XXIV the marvellous is considered only as a cause of pleasure and not in relation with the katharsis.

[3] Rome, 1631; Cologne edition, 1633.

[4] 'Admiratio est quaedam pars timoris ex aliqua re, sensu animove percepta, quae nostram facultatem excedat...Oriri potest...vel ab inanimis, vel brutis, vel hominibus. Ab inanimis cum casu, & fortuna fit, quod consilio factum.' Here he tells the story of the murderer of Itys, killed by the fall of his victim's statue, which Aristotle used as an example of the marvellous. Donatus continues: 'A brutis sumitur admiratio, tanquam multa prudenter agentibus...Ex hominibus tragica nascitur admiratio cum vires omnes & animum intendunt, ut aliquo sive lapsu, sive imminenti lapsus poena se expediant; nec tamen evitare possunt: idque malum quanto horribilius, tanto mirabilius est.' *Ars Poetica*, p. 163.

[5] 'Der Poet...[ist] bemühet / Erstaunen / oder Hermen und Mitleiden zu erregen / jedoch dieses mehr als jenes. Durch das Erstaunen wird gleichsam ein kalter Angstschweisz verursacht und wird von der Furcht unterschieden / als welche von grosser Gefahr entstehet; dieses aber von einer Unthat und erschröcklichen Grausamkeit welche wir hören oder sehen. Solche Gemüthsbewegung findet sich / wann wir ein Laster scheuen ernstlich und plötzlich straffen / dasz wir in unsrem Gewissen auch befinden;...' *Poetischer Trichter*, 1650, Vol. II, p. 84. See also his letter to Klaj, prefixed to the latter's *Herodes der Kindermörder*, 1645, p. 57.

[6] He promised 'den gecreuzigten Christus in einem Trauerspiele vorzustellen / darinnen die Zuhörer zu barmhertzigen Mitleiden geführet werden / wie ihnen hier ein grausames Furchterstaunen ankommen / als welches die vornemsten Bewegungen seyn / die in Trauerspielen zu beobachten.' *Herodes der Kindermörder*, 1645.

Daniel Omeis in one instance mentioned pity and astonishment as the aim of tragedy[1] and as late as 1723 the classical philologist Daniel Triller described the sources of the tragic emotions as 'das Erbärmliche, das Erschröckliche und Wunderbare.' The latter double element was manifestly intended to produce an 'admiratio' mingled of astonishment and awe[2].

It has thus been clearly established that in German dramatic criticism before Gottsched, the tragic 'admiratio' was conceived in the now archaic sense of astonishment, 'Verwunderung'; that it was considered as closely allied to fear and directly connected with Aristotle's theory of the marvellous. It might perhaps be said that there was no other interpretation current in Germany at that time, since in the course of a systematic survey of the period no divergent instance has come to the author's knowledge. When now we come to Gottsched, the inclusion of 'admiratio' amongst the kathartic emotions has already a tradition behind it. But is it the same 'admiratio'? He calls it 'Bewunderung[3],' although a dozen years later in his remarks on Addison's *Cato* he speaks of 'Erstaunen[4].' Whence this confusion?

It will be remembered perhaps, that Minturno[5] had put much stress upon the mission of the poet to move admiration, in the modern sense, for great men. A poem he held to be futile unless it excites admiration for the hero depicted[6]. This view, applied by Minturno only to poetry in general was first connected with the drama and specifically with the katharsis-clause by Corneille[7]. As has been justly observed[8] the term 'admiratio' in Elizabethan criticism, even though joined with 'commiseration,' applies rather to the general purpose of poetry than to the function of tragedy. The references e.g. in Sidney's *Apologie*[1] are of the most elusive character and no one could say definitely which meaning is given to the word[2]. It is quite plain that Corneille in this instance was giving one more wrench to Aristotelian theory 'pour n'être pas obligé de condamner beaucoup de poèmes que nous avons vu réussir sur nos théâtres,' notably his own, of which before 1651, twenty-one out of a total of thirty-four had seen the light. It was time, when in the *Préface de Nicomède* (1651), he seized on admiration to explain a series of heroes, who had been steadily repudiating all the softer emotions, all human weaknesses, and had finally turned into mere embodiments of ambition and pride. But perhaps he would not have thought of exploiting the traditional 'admiratio' if the temper of the period, as expressed e.g. by Descartes[3] had not been favourable to it. Besides, the word 'admiration' may have been well along in its shift from the older dual meaning of 'astonishment' or 'admiration' to the modern single sense of 'admiration.' Here was an element of change which was lacking in Germany, where the Latin term with its dual meaning persisted, or was translated by vernacular words such as 'Erstaunen,' of entirely dissimilar extraction.

---

[1] *Gründliche Anleitung*, 1704, p. 246. The aim is to bring men 'zum Mitleiden und Erstaunen...und durch Anschauen jäher Straff-Fälle von den Lastern abzuschrecken.' In his more formal definition of tragedy (p. 232), however, he speaks only of 'Schrecken und Mitleiden.'

[2] As examples of 'das Erschröckliche und Wunderbare' he mentions 'die schnelle und ungewöhnliche Verfinsterung der Sonnen, das schreckliche Erschüttern der Erde, die brüllende Zerreissung der Felsen'...and the like (*Hugonis Grotii Leidender Christus*, Leipzig, 1723).

[3] 'Die Tragödie [hatte] zu ihrer Absicht...Traurigkeit, Schrecken, Mitleiden und Bewunderung bey den Zuschauern zu erwecken' (*Critische Dichtkunst*, 1730, p. 507).

[4] ...'wodurch er...das Mitleid seiner Zuhörer erwecket, ja äuszerlich Schrecken und Erstaunen zuwege bringt' (*Critische Dichtkunst* (3rd edition), 1742, p. 712).

[5] *De Poeta*, 1559, p. 11.

[6] Cf. Spingarn, *Literary Criticism in the Renaissance*, 2nd ed., p. 52.

[7] Speaking of his *Nicomède* he declared: 'Dans l'admiration qu'on a de sa vertu, je trouve une manière de purger les passions dont n'a point parlé Aristote, et qui est peut-être plus sûre que celle qu'il prescrit à la tragédie par le moyen de la pitié et de la crainte' (*Examen de Nicomède*, Corneille, *Œuvres*, ed. Marty-Laveaux, Vol. v, p. 508). Cf. Jules Lemaître, *Corneille et la poétique d'Aristote*, Paris, 1888, p. 78; Joh. Böhm, *Die dramatischen Theorien Pierre Corneilles*, Berlin, 1901, p. 70.

[8] Gregory Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, Oxford, 1904, Vol. II, pp. 392 ff.

After Corneille the 'admiratio' in the modern sense had the field all to itself. It was recognized by Dacier[4] who vowed that Aristotle would have disqualified Corneille's *Nicomède* for the very quality which gave occasion to its author's theory. Boileau wrote approvingly to Perrault about Corneille's 'nouveau genre de tragédie inconnu à Aristote'[5] as a critic might well do whose distaste for surprising and marvellous happenings[6] unfitted him to appreciate the other meaning of 'admiratio.' By the same token Saint-Évremond, the sworn enemy of the would-be marvellous devices of the opera, proclaimed admiration 'a tragic passion'[7] whilst Le Bossu had already claimed admiration for the tragic as well as for the epic hero[8].

---

[1] *Eliz. Crit. Essays*, Vol. I, pp. 177, 199; Vol. II, p. 201.

[2] Vossius' conception (*Poetices*, 1647, cap. XIX) referred to by Arnaud (*Les théories dramatiques au XVII^e^ siècle*, Paris, 1888, p. 155) as connected with the marvellous, was apparently the traditional one. I am unable at this moment to examine the passage.

[3] Cf. Lanson, *Le héros cornélien et le 'généreux' selon Descartes. Étude sur les rapports de la psychologie de Corneille et de la psychologie de Descartes. Revue d'hist. litt. de la Fr.* Vol. I, p. 397 ff.

[4] *La Poétique d'Aristote*, 1692, pp. 148; 185 ff.

[5] Lettre à Perrault, 1700, ap. Robert, *La poétique de Racine*, Paris, 1891, p. 62. Saint-Évremond wrote about 1692: 'Corneille, profitant des lumières que le temps apporte, trouve des beautés qu'Aristote ne connaissait pas.' *Œuvres*, ed. Des Maiseaux, 1753, Vol. VI, p. 17. Cf. A. Bourgoin, *Les maitres de la critique au XVII^e^ siècle*, Paris, 1889, p. 109, n. 3.

[6] Cf. *Art poétique*, III, 27—37; 51—54.

[7] Cf. *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, Vol. I, p. 392.

[8] *Traité du poème épique*, 1657. Cf. Petsch, *l.c.* p. xxi, n. 2.

There is no need to adduce further evidence: Corneille's innovation had been accepted and by Gottsched's time the modern meaning of 'admiratio' had established itself in the critical world of France and England.

It is easy to see now what happened in Germany. Gottsched knew Corneille and Saint-Évremond, Boileau and Perrault, but also some of the older German critics. In 1714, as 'Fuchs' at the University of Königsberg, his text-book for Professor Rohde's *Collegium Poeticum* had been Menantes-Hunold's *Allerneueste zur Art reinen und galanten Poesie zu gelangen*[1]. And later on, although it is impossible to be sure about it, he very probably read Klaj's *Herodes der Kindermörder* and Harsdörfer's letter about it, both of which were discussed by Johann Elias Schlegel in an article published in Gottsched's *Critische Beyträge*[2], a year before Gottsched used the word 'Erstaunen.' Gottsched also knew about Triller's edition of Grotius' *Christus Patiens*[3], and thus may have been acquainted with three of the principal sources of reference for the early development of the 'admiratio' in Germany.

The older German interpretation had connected the 'admiratio' with the marvellous, *τὸ θαυμαστόν*, which is mainly an element of the action. The 'Cornelian' interpretation connected admiration with character[4], the character of the hero, and thus came into conflict with the Aristotelian theory of *ἁμαρτία*, which excludes the flawless hero, i.e. the hero often most likely to be admired, from the tragic stage. Also in the older view, it will be noticed, for reasons which it would take too long to unravel here, 'admiratio' was bracketed with fear, whereas in the 'French' view it was connected with pity[5].

J. E. GILLET.

URBANA, ILL. U.S.A.

---

[1] Hamburg, 1707. Cf. the preface to the *Critische Dichtkunst*.

[2] Vol. VII (1741), p. 355 f.

[3] Mentioned in his *Nöthiger Vorrath*, 1757—1765, i, p. 297.

[4] Mendelssohn, in the above-quoted passage (p. 234, n.1), without expressing it quite clearly, has certainly perceived this. The distinction between 'mirari' and 'admirari' may not be so sharp as he assumes it to be, yet the *Thesaurus* quotes the fifth-century grammarian Agroecius as saying: 'miramus opera, admiramur virtutes.'

[5] Thus, quite consistently, Lessing's final view on admiration was that it was only an element in pity, pity being an emotion made up of admiration and pain. Cf. Robertson, *l.c.* p. 328.

REVIEWS.

Iacob and Iosep. Edited by ARTHUR S. NAPIER. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1916. 8vo. xxii + 41 pp.

The story of *Iacob and Iosep* is found in MS. Bodley 652, apparently written soon after the middle of the thirteenth century. It was first published by W. Heuser in *Bonner Beiträge,* 1905, but we feel deeply indebted to the late Professor Napier for proceeding with his edition, begun long before that date.

This edition is a model of its kind; it gives every requisite for a complete understanding of the text, including a facsimile of two pages of the MS. and an excellent account of the phonology, metre, dialect, etc. of the poem.

Professor Napier holds that the composition of the poem may be assigned to the same period as the MS. The dialect is that of the South-west. It is written in couplets, the lines having sometimes seven, sometimes six, stresses; there are traces of alliteration and assonance.

As a literary creation *Iacob and Iosep* is a masterpiece of its kind. It has the simplicity, vigour and directness of the early epic. With true dramatic instinct the poet—some wandering clerk or minstrel—picks out the most moving and picturesque incidents in the Old Testament narrative. His last story, he tells us (l. 21), was of Noah and the Flood, he now turns to the marvellous fate of Joseph and the love of Jacob for this son. But it is a Joseph in an English feudal setting, whose father, Jacob, is a 'lord,' who sits 'in halle' (ll. 31, 65, 169), whose mother, Rachel, wears 'a smoc' (l. 176), and who on his arrival into Egypt is taken to a 'burȝ' which had

> Castles heie ⁊ proute, stretes wide ⁊ long,
> Mani feir halle ⁊ mani feir bour,
> Whit so eni lilie, briȝt so eni flour. (ll. 146—8)

The castles have 'drawbridges' (l. 363) and 'porters' guard the gates (l. 369). The sons of Jacob on their way to Joseph's castle were overtaken by a 'menestral,' who bore 'his harpe arugge' (l. 360) very much in the way our author might have done. 'Pharaon,' the king, went a-shooting in the wood with his 'bowe i-bent' (l. 194) and he told his dream to 'Vrles ⁊ barons ⁊ burgeis ful bolde' (l. 291). His wife, the queen, was a 'leuedi' in 'boure' (ll. 203, 204) who wore a 'wimpel' on her proud head (l. 224). 'Putifar þe stiward' had in his following 'mani a kniȝtes sone' (l. 160), and Joseph humbly addressed his fellow-prisoners as 'Sire baxtere' (266), 'Sire botiler' (268).

The poet has apparently no religious or didactic purpose in view; like a true artist he seems to tell the story for its own sake, though with a lingering hope that the 'meri song, gamen 7 feire tale' (l. 5) in the hall may keep men from the coarser pleasures of the tavern where, alas, they are wont to 'comen erliche' for their ale and sit 'ful longe,' filling their bellies and then sleeping like pigs (ll. 6—12). It is far better, he concludes, 'for to here þis tale þen to drinke win,' a sentiment which can be endorsed seven centuries later. For how often, even now in these latter days, does one meet with lines so vivid, strong and moving as the following?—

> Þo Iacob iherde þat Iosep was aliue
> Nas neuer for his child fader so bliþe.
> He caste awei his crucche, his mantel he feng,
> Feire he platte his her wiþ a selkene streng.
> He toc his benetene hat wiþ pal þat was biweued.
> 'Of sor 7 of serewe nou ich am bereued,
> For nou me þuncheþ þat ich mai flen as an ern
> For þe loue of Iosep, mi leueste bern.'
> Iacob rod singinde, such hit were a child,
> 'For þe loue of Iosep nou ich am ʒung 7 wild.' (ll. 513—22)

ANNA C. PAUES.

CAMBRIDGE.

Chaucer's Lollius. By G. L. KITTREDGE (Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, vol. XXVIII, pp. 47–133).

Professor Kittredge's essay is probably exhaustive enough to please everybody, and conclusive enough to please the large majority. The cumulative evidence of his facts seems to point overwhelmingly in one direction; but the author frequently weakens his case by over-eagerness to convince us. These matters are not capable of Euclidean demonstration; and when, on the second page, we are told that 'the inference is mathematically certain,' it is not our indolence or vagueness of mind, but our sense of logic, which rises in rebellion at once. In rapid succession we read 'Chaucer certainly believed,' 'one thing, however, we do know,' 'undoubtedly he supposed,' and 'this too, is of course not in the *Filostrato*. One would know that well enough without taking heed to one's books.' By this time we are in open revolt against a critic who tells us that we may be cock-sure without even looking at our documents. And if, after all, we rise from this book in almost complete agreement with Prof. Kittredge, it is because his facts are often more convincing than his arguments.

His theory may be briefly stated. Chaucer believed (and probably got the blunder from someone else) that there had been a Lollius who wrote on the Trojan War. When he himself wrote on that subject, being more anxious (like many other medieval authors) to disclaim originality than to claim it, he professed to base his whole *Troilus* upon this supposed poem by Lollius, twice mentioned by name, but generally referred to more vaguely as 'myne auctor,' 'olde bokes,' etc., etc. He did *not* mean to acknowledge his obligations to Boccaccio under the name of Lollius; indeed, some of these 'acknowledgments' occur where his debt to Boccaccio is least, or even non-existent. His main idea was to lend verisimilitude to his story by claiming for it an original of unquestionable authority, as Mr Hewlett claims to base his *Richard Yea and Nay* on the lost chronicle of Milo the Carthusian. All this seems pretty clearly proved by the facts Professor Kittredge produces; and I must now confess myself a convert from delusions, hitherto vaguely entertained, that some other solution was almost equally probable. So far as I venture to criticise, therefore, it will only be on points of detail.

The most important is the question of literary morality, which we do not get rid of by simply reminding ourselves that these things were different in the Middle Ages. Even fourteenth-century kings and courtiers would have thought more highly of a man who could invent all *Troilus*, or strike all this fire from the flint of ancient Latin, than of a man who was indebted for a great many of his finest scenes and lines to a contemporary Italian. Quite apart from laudable artistic devices, therefore, Chaucer had a selfish temptation to ignore Boccaccio, and he does ignore him with remarkable consistency not only in the *Troilus*, but wherever else he borrows from him. To explain this entirely away is mere special pleading. Professor Kittredge seems persistently to ignore the difference between 'conveying' from an ancient and from a contemporary. Nor are we convinced by his psychology. He writes on p. 59, 'Can there be the slightest doubt that Chaucer told those intimate friends of his [Gower and Strode] all he knew about the *Filostrato*?' We cannot pigeon-hole men's minds and actions like this; the alternative here assumed as impossible is almost the counterpart of what was actually done by an English poet, at one of our greatest universities, within the memory of living man. It seems equally rash to assume that, because we find Lydgate had some inkling of the truth, therefore 'there had never been any secret about the derivation of the *Troilus* from the *Filostrato*' (p. 61). Things are not always so simple as this in real life; and, in expounding literature, we must resist the temptation of making a *hortus siccus* from Parnassus. On p. 77, Professor Kittredge could strengthen his case very much by arguing from Chaucer's known blunders in translating Boethius, (in spite of the help he got from the French version), to his very probable misapprehension of these two lines from Horace. Why does he mark *scrĭbit* short on p. 80? and why need a medieval reader be 'careless' to refer *sua* to Lollius, since in the Middle Ages *suus* was regularly so used? These reservations, it will be seen, do nothing to obscure what seem the main facts, that Prof. Kittredge's industry has put us all in his debt for ample materials to decide this problem, and that most readers are likely to accept his decision on one of the most stubbornly-debated points in Chaucer's literary career.

G. G. Coulton.

Great Shelford, Cambridge.

Common Conditions. Edited by TUCKER BROOKE. (Elizabethan Club Reprints, I.) New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1915. Large 4to. xvi + 90 pp.

This strange specimen of primitive romantic comedy was first brought before modern readers by Prof. Brandl, who printed it in his *Quellen* (1898) from the Chatsworth copy, the only one then known to be extant. This is seriously defective, lacking the first and last sheets (16 pages out of 56). In 1907 a complete copy, of an earlier and more correct edition[1], was purchased by Quaritch from the Mostyn Hall library, and it is this which Prof. Brooke has now reprinted. The text reproduces the original, page for page, in the handsome black-letter of the Chiswick Press. The editor has spared no pains. He has collated the two extant copies and given the results in detail, together with a complete list of the errors in Prof. Brandl's reprint. The Introduction and Appendix I deal with the history of the two copies, and with the plot, authorship, and date of the play. Lastly, there is a large body of useful Notes, explanatory and critical.

When the play was known only in a grievously imperfect form, wanting both beginning and end, critics amused themselves by forecasting the manner of its conclusion. The complete text shows them at fault, but, strange to say, presents us with no satisfactory ending. The writer seems to have tired of his work; having brought one pair of lovers to a sudden and quite unaccountable end by poison, he breaks off short, leaving the other strands of the plot unravelled. In the Epilogue he explains that he is afraid of wearying the audience!

> So time saith to vs seace now here, your audience mutch ye wrong
> If farther now to weary them the time ye do prolonge.

The title-page of the newly-discovered copy, besides informing us that the plot is 'drawne out of the most famous historie of Galiarbus Duke of Arabia,' gives an explanatory list of the 'Players names.' As a guide to the reader, this is actually less helpful than the list drawn up (from the incomplete text) by Prof. Brandl. It treats Sedmond and Nomides as distinct characters, whereas the latter (= Sedmond spelt backwards) is merely the name assumed by Sedmond when he goes disguised. Similarly it offers no hint that Clarisia and Metrea are one and the same person. On the other hand, Prof. Brandl is now seen to have gone beyond the mark in supposing Lomia, the 'naturall foole,' to be a disguise of the versatile Vice 'Common Conditions'; in the last sheet (sig. G *verso*) Lomia and Conditions come on together in an animated scene: 'Here entreth Lomia for hir misteris and the vice iustling hir.'

Of the authorship of *Common Conditions* nothing is known. In its versification, in certain marked peculiarities of vocabulary and grammar, in recurring oddities of style and an all-pervading quaintness and bathos, in particular incidents of plot and situation, it bears a striking resemblance to *Clyomon and Clamydes* (printed in 1599)[1]. As both pieces are anonymous it matters little whether we suppose them to be by the same hand, or by two authors who fell in with a fashion of the time—that time being probably about 1576, in which year *Common Conditions* was licensed for printing.

---

[1] Both books are without date, but Prof. Brooke has carefully and conclusively marshalled the evidence for this statement.

Our editor has corrected some obvious errors in the text, but is otherwise cautious and sparing of conjectural emendation. His 'Bee bold' for 'Beehold' (l. 1285), 'true' for 'loue' (l. 1783), may be accepted as certain. In l. 983 his suggestion of 'a bafte' (=abaft) for 'a baste' is decidedly to be preferred to Carpenter's 'avast,' in view of what is known of the history of either word.

I add a few comments on the Notes.

l. 5. *But thus I shew, most strange it is.* The editor thinks 'thus' is a misprint for 'this.' But the speaker of the Prologue uses 'we' throughout, not 'I.' Possibly 'I shew' is meant for the past participle; cf. the old 'i-blowe,' 'i-throwe,' 'i-growe' (= blown, thrown, grown) and Spenser's 'knowe' = known (*Sheph. Cal.* Sept. l. 161).

l. 60. *seeme* is explained to mean 'deign.' Here, as in many other places in the play, it rather means 'think' or 'attempt' (to do something). It might be added that the word is found, though less frequently, in *Clyomon* with the same peculiar meaning.

l. 872. The editor proposes to rectify the line by omitting 'or set.' These words are indeed an otiose alternative to the preceding 'fixt.' Similarly in l. 1514 (where the editor has no comment) both sense and metre would be amended by omitting 'dead &' before 'drowned.' But we ought perhaps rather to regard 'Madame,' which begins the line we are considering, as *extra metrum.* Cf. ll. 1109, 1171, 1359, 1442, 1616 for a similar initial redundancy (usually a vocative). This peculiarity deserved notice, all the more that it is frequent in *Clyomon*; in Dyce's later edition of that play these extra-metrical ejaculations or addresses are printed in a separate line, a method familiar to readers of Attic drama.

l. 908. *Dele* the definite article in the title of Cowley's play.

l. 1124. Both quartos give: *And with this goring blade of thine deride this hart from wo.* The editor has adopted Manly's 'deuide.' I venture to suggest 'decide' (=cut off).

l. 1330. *it* misprinted for 'yet.' A probable example of 'yet' conversely misprinted for 'it' will be found noted in Dyce's edition of Beaumont and Fletcher, vol. 9, p. 126.

l. 1348. *For who.* The editor suggests 'For ho,' Prof. Manly 'For oh.' The sense would be better served by 'For why' (= because), which similarly begins the line elsewhere in this play and in *Clyomon.*

l. 1415. *a you mocke.* *a* surely stands, not for 'if,' but for 'ah,' as in the preceding line.

---

[1] 'Both plays are plainly by one author,' wrote F. G. Fleay in 1890. Prof. Brandl dealt summarily with the parallelisms of language and style. Our editor points out 'five specific parallels' in plot or situation.

l. 1499. To the editor's instances of the proverb it is pertinent to add *Clyomon* l. 840, where 'cowardly hearts' takes the place of 'faint harts.'

l. 1639. The editor thinks that in *Cambises* l. 26 'in that your Grace request,' 'request' stands for 'requesteth.' Surely it is the substantive, 'Grace' being possessive as in l. 536 'your Grace behest.'

l. 1693. *Bee your leaue.* The editor's own note shows that he ought not to have altered 'Bee' to 'By.'

l. 1696. *at the last cast.* I see no chance of acceptance for the suggestion that in this well-known phrase 'cast' may be the participle of the verb 'cass' = dismiss.

l. 1699. *if I had not stand stiffe to.* The note calls this 'an intentional error for *stood.*' The speaker is indeed a half-witted rustic, yet she is correct enough in using this form of the past participle.

l. 1756. *my bord.* It seems forced to explain this as = bourd, jest. It is probably only a misprint for 'my lord.' The repetition is quite in Lomia's style.

An Englishman can hardly record without a pang that, since the beginning of the twentieth century, both Quartos have been forced to quit their *Lares patrios* and to cross the Atlantic[1]. Yet, sentiment apart, the student of Elizabethan Drama is the gainer, at any rate as regards the Mostyn copy. For the 200 years it was in the Mostyn Hall library, its very existence was unknown outside. It is no sooner housed in the library of the Elizabethan Club of Yale University than it is made accessible to all in this handsome and scholarly volume, for which hearty thanks are due to the editor, the Club, and the publishers.

WALTER WORRALL.

OXFORD.

Shakespeare and Chapman. By J. M. ROBERTSON. London: T. Fisher Unwin, Ltd. 1917. 8vo. 302 pp.

The two main theses of this book are that Chapman was (i) the author of the poem entitled *A Lover's Complaint,* published by T. Thorpe with Shakespeare's Sonnets in the first edition of 1609, and (ii) the 'originator,' or author of the first draft, of *Timon of Athens.* Argument in support of these propositions fills two-thirds of the volume, the remainder being devoted to less elaborate discussions of various other plays usually assigned to Shakespeare in which the writer sees reason to suspect the presence of Chapman's hand.

It seems convenient to examine Mr Robertson's arguments concerning the two works mentioned above apart from the other problems indicated by him, since it is in regard to these alone that he asks us to accept his results as conclusive: 'The case for Chapman's authorship of *A Lover's Complaint* is made out decisively; and the case for his origination of *Timon of Athens* substantially, though...with less obvious completeness,' is the claim made in the 'epilogue' with which the volume concludes.

---

[1] The Chatsworth copy, Prof. Brooke informs us, passed into the possession of H. E. Huntington, Esq., of New York, in 1914.

Mr Robertson's theory of Chapman's authorship of *A Lover's Complaint* appears to owe its inception partly to Mr Arthur Acheson's *Shakespeare and the Rival Poet*, partly to Professor Mackail's essay on the poem published in the English Association's volume of *Studies and Sketches* for 1912. He follows Mr Acheson not only in identifying Chapman with the 'rival poet' of the Sonnets, but in the quest of manifestations of a 'partly hostile' relationship in the works of both poets, repeating many of Mr Acheson's arguments and re-enforcing them with others of his own. In rejecting Shakespeare's authorship of *A Lover's Complaint* he follows Professor Mackail, adopting the hypothesis tentatively advanced by him that this poem is the work of the rival poet. Mr Acheson does not attribute *A Lover's Complaint* to the rival poet, nor does Professor Mackail accept the identification of the rival poet with Chapman. What is new, then, in Mr Robertson's book, so far as *A Lover's Complaint* is concerned, is the attempt to prove that Chapman was its author and that it was written by him in emulation of Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*.

In his discussion of the evidence of the rivalry between Chapman and Shakespeare alleged to exist in the works of both authors, Mr Robertson has little to add to Mr Acheson's ingenious treatment of the same theme. Incidentally he agrees with him in accepting the Holofernes of *Love's Labour's Lost* as a skit on Chapman. In all this part of the book the unimaginative critic will, it is to be feared, see nothing but a tissue of more or less plausible conjectures. To him the relation, so obvious to Mr Acheson and Mr Robertson, between the lines in *Love's Labour's Lost* (IV. iii. 346–7):

> Never durst poet touch a pen to write
> Until his ink were temper'd with Love's sighs

and the couplet from Chapman's *Shadow of Night*:

> No pen can anything eternal write
> That is not steeped in humour of the night

will seem more than questionable, and he will flatly deny Mr Robertson's assertion that 'the accost of Armado to Holofernes (v. i. 86) and the reply:

> Do you not educate youth at the charge-house on the top of the mountain?
> *Hol.* Or *mons*, the hill.

suggest that Chapman, who avowedly came from Hitchin Hill, had there been a schoolmaster.' Mr Robertson adds that this is 'the only hypothesis we have as to his earlier occupation.' It is difficult to see what value can possibly attach to an hypothesis resting on such a foundation. Were there any evidence that Chapman was ever a schoolmaster, one might accept this as a possible allusion to him; the absence of such evidence reduces this 'hypothesis' to a mere guess. There is more in this vein than the sober student will tolerate, forcibly recalling the wilder speculations of Messrs Simpson and Fleay, and not easily to be distinguished from the 'Baconic' methods of criticism for which Mr Robertson professes so hearty a contempt.

But to the poem. Whatever may appear on an analytic examination of *A Lover's Complaint*, there cannot be said to be any obvious resemblance between its style and that of any verse published under Chapman's name. It is more in Shakespeare's manner than anything Chapman is known to have written. For one thing it is in rime-royal, the metrical form used by Shakespeare in *The Rape of Lucrece*, but not found (so far as I know) in any of Chapman's recognized poetical works, and few critics will be disposed to deny—what is indeed frankly admitted by Professor Mackail—that it 'contains some passages quite Shakespearean in their quality,' a few even that reach almost to the level of the best of Shakespeare's verse, whilst others—to quote Professor Mackail again—'might have been written by any clever versifier who had studied Shakespeare and learned the trick, so far as it is a trick.' If *A Lover's Complaint* is indeed the work of some clever imitator of Shakespeare, Chapman's strong individuality and almost contemptuous aloofness from current literary fashions would dispose of any question of his authorship; at least, there is nothing, even in his earlier compositions, that lends any countenance to the suggestion that he was capable of a deliberate imitation of the manner and metre of a contemporary. An admission of the Shakespearean or quasi-Shakespearean quality of the verse of the *Complaint* would, as Mr Robertson could scarcely fail to realize, be fatal to his theory, and he for one is not prepared to make any such admission. The quality even of its best lines is to him no more than an 'Elizabethan' quality, a quality elsewhere, in particular, exhibited in the plays and poems of Chapman. How far his citations from these plays and poems bear out this contention is necessarily a question that each reader must answer for himself. To the present writer, at least, the similarity of the passages chosen for comparison is by no means such as to suggest identity of authorship. What one may reasonably expect to find in the passages compared is a rhythmic resemblance and this seems to be altogether lacking.

The examination of the syntactical peculiarities of the *Complaint*, moreover, falls far short of furnishing the required testimony in Chapman's favour, the occasional ellipses of the subject and the verb being features common to a large number of the poets of this time, especially ellipsis of the relative pronoun as in several of the examples quoted from Chapman. This particular ellipsis is not found in the *Complaint*, and the admission that the poem affords no instance of Chapman's habit—first noticed by Mr Fleay—of rhyming by false syllabic stress, is of itself sufficient to counterbalance the rather meagre evidence adduced in support of the assertion that 'any poem of Chapman's' affords instances of 'every vice or whim of style' exhibited in the *Complaint*.

The evidence of the vocabulary is equally unconvincing. Mr Robertson properly devotes much attention to vocabulary tests as an aid to the solution of problems of authorship, and both here and in his earlier work on *Titus Andronicus* he has some sound observations as to the method in which these tests should be applied, and the danger of placing too much reliance upon occasional verbal coincidences. What, then, is the method he has chosen to test the vocabulary of *A Lover's Complaint*, and what results does it yield?

The poem contains, it appears, 29 words not found in the Shakespeare concordance outside the *Complaint*. Mr Robertson leads his three trump cards—*maund, affectedly*, and *invise*, all to be found in Chapman. But after this he has nothing of any value left in his hand. He cannot find *unexperient*, though Chapman has *experient*, he 'has not noted' *fluxive*, nor *untuck'd*, nor *enswath'd, habitude* or *annexion*, though Chapman has words rather like them. *Threaden* does not occur in Chapman's works but he uses *thread* 'with a similar descriptive effect'... 'such forms as *sheav'd* and *lover'd* are much in his manner'...'*fastly* and *weepingly* are notably Chapmanesque,' and so on, but the fact remains that Mr Robertson is only able to trace one other of these 'once-used' words to Chapman, *sawn*—and that a 'required' word in the sense that it is used for the sake of rime. This gives a total yield of four words out of twenty-nine; not a very striking result. Next follows a list of eight 'substantially non-Shakespearean' words, one of which is used by Chapman. Passing over a list of sixteen words used in a different sense from their Shakespearean use, with which Mr Robertson has slightly better luck, we are confronted with a fourth list 'of similar evidential importance' consisting of twelve words 'only once or rarely' used by Shakespeare. In what way the presence of these words can be supposed to assist Mr Robertson's case it is not easy to understand, especially as (with one exception) all occur in undisputed plays, and the list comprises a few that are distinctly uncommon. The fact that only six of the twelve can be found in Chapman, so far as it is evidence at all, is evidence against him. Of other admittedly Shakespearean words in the *Complaint* not in common use, Mr Robertson has nothing to say, and we are left in doubt as to whether any of them are used by Chapman.

Throughout this book the author handles his evidence in the spirit of the advocate determined to get a conviction. No point is too trivial if it can be made to lend any colour to his theory, while his attempts to 'explain away' facts that tell against him display a resourcefulness and mental agility so obtrusive as to inspire distrust. The following paragraph (from a section headed 'Marks of Chapman') is typical of his method:

> The false one in the *Complaint*, further, gets 'browny locks...in crooked curls,' curls being among Chapman's favourite properties. [Here follow seven passages from his poems in which the word 'curl' or 'curled' appears.] 'Crooked,' again, in the sense of curved, is a constant epithet of Chapman's. Never does Shakespeare, apart from this poem, apply that epithet to a curl. Out of a dozen uses of the word in the Concordance, there is but one instance with the possible force of 'curling' ('crooked smokes' in *Cymbeline*—where there arises another problem), and one

with the force of 'curved'—'crooked figure' in the first prologue to *Henry V*, a highly problematic item to be dealt with later. The normal meaning of the word in Shakespeare is always 'bent,' morally or physically, and its application is usually disparaging. But with Chapman the normal meaning is 'curved.' With him bows are always crooked, eagles and vultures have 'crooked beaks'...an ox's horn is 'crookt,' even a scythe is so described.

Not being able to cite from Chapman any passage in which the epithet 'crooked' is applied to a curl, it would surely have been better had Mr Robertson left the word alone instead of hinting at 'problems' in connexion with the two plays in which it is used in a sense that he would rather not find in Shakespeare. Unfortunately for him in this particular instance the suggestion is altogether futile, for apart from the instances quoted from *Cymbeline* and *Henry V*, Shakespeare has 'crooked' in the sense of 'curved' in *Lucrece*, where (505–8) Tarquin's Roman blade held aloft over Lucrece is compared to the 'crooked beak' of 'a falcon towering in the skies.' When, after so patent a failure as this, the writer resumes his investigation with the complacent remark, 'And the clues continue,' serious doubts begin to arise as to whether they can even be said to have begun.

A no less glaring instance in which Mr Robertson's zeal in the pursuit of verbal clues has led him to advance wholly unwarrantable claims on Chapman's behalf is presented in the comment (p. 72) on the passage

If I had *self-applied*
Love to *myself*

that 'such tautology in pursuit of metre points to Chapman's tic of combining "self" with other words.' Nothing even remotely analogous is cited from Chapman's works, but merely a list of 'self' compounds such as can with equal ease be extracted from Shakespeare, while in Shakespeare's 62nd Sonnet—not one of those impugned by Mr Robertson—we actually do find the lines

Mine own self-love quite contrary I read;
Self so self-loving were iniquity.

Unless, which it is difficult to believe, Mr Robertson failed to notice this sonnet, there seems no excuse for the suggestion that the passage quoted from the *Complaint* affords a 'special clue to Chapman.'

In the course of an investigation such as this a few errors in points of detail are doubtless almost unavoidable, but these inaccurate statements are illustrative of the author's habitual tendency to overstate the effect of his evidence, and even to suggest the presence of clues where none exist. Far from affording conclusive proof of Chapman's authorship of the poem as Mr Robertson contends, it is doubtful whether the peculiarities of syntax and construction noted in the *Complaint* or its coincidences with Chapman's authentic work in thought, diction and vocabulary will, to an impartial observer, raise the slightest presumption in his favour.

For Chapman's participation in *Timon of Athens* a rather stronger case is presented both on stylistic grounds and on the evidence of vocabulary. But even here it does not seem possible to concede anything more than that the non-Shakespearean parts of this play are written in a style rather more like Chapman's than the style of the *Complaint*, and too much importance is certainly attached to the presence of a few supposedly non-Shakespearean words common to Chapman and the author or authors of the play. Further the principle of awarding the authorship of a doubtfully Shakespearean piece to the writer who appears to have used the largest proportion of 'once-used' words seems unsound. The proper method is to ascertain from a close examination of the suspected author's authentic works the characteristic features of his vocabulary, whether in the use of common or uncommon words, and to test the vocabulary of the doubtful work in the light of the knowledge thus acquired. Similarly it is not enough that Mr Robertson has succeeded in compiling from Chapman's works quite a respectable list of extracts akin in sentiment to passages in *Timon of Athens*. Anyone familiar with the literature of the Elizabethan period will know that a diligent search for parallels in the works of any voluminous writer would be bound to yield a substantial harvest of a kind. Far more convincing to the sceptic would be evidence that the play alleged to be Chapman's contained at least one or two characteristic allusions recurrent in undisputed works. Mr Robertson had an instrument ready to his hand in Professor Parrott's admirable edition of the dramatist's Tragedies. There attention is drawn to numbers of allusions found in two or more plays, or in the poems as well as in the plays. In none of the dramas here attributed to Chapman, at least so far as I have been able to discover, has the presence of any of these allusions been detected.

Moreover in the case of *Timon of Athens* there is an *a priori* objection to the theory of Chapman's authorship altogether ignored by Mr Robertson. In discussing *A Lover's Complaint* and *Love's Labour's Lost* he has much to say of Chapman's pedantry and parade of scholarship. Surely in this of all plays we should expect some manifestation of his knowledge of the institutions and traditions of Greece. 'Except for a brief allusion to the "great towers, trophies and schools," which Alcibiades is begged to spare,' as Dr Boas observes, 'there is not a hint to show that the dramatist had any conception of the artistic and intellectual glories of Athens in its prime. He was evidently as unfamiliar with the conditions of Periclean Greece as of Homeric.' How comes it that the translator of Homer shows no familiarity with the conditions of Homeric Greece? Some satisfactory answer to this question is required before we can accept the view that this apparently composite drama is substantially Chapman's.

If the internal evidence upon which Mr Robertson relies to establish Chapman's responsibility for *A Lover's Complaint* and *Timon of Athens* fails to satisfy the reader, it is unlikely that the suggestions contained in the later part of the volume—that the same dramatist may also have been concerned in *Pericles* and some sixteen or seventeen plays of the first Shakespeare folio—will meet with much favour. In these cases, as the author admits, 'the measure of proof is avowedly inferior.' His interest in his task obviously began to flag long before it was completed. *Shakespeare and Chapman* is not written with one-half the vigour displayed in his treatise on *Titus Andronicus.* There he had a good case, and handled it with uncommon skill. Here his material has proved intractable.

H. DUGDALE SYKES.

ENFIELD.

The Poetry of Giacomo da Lentino, Sicilian poet of the thirteenth century. Edited by ERNEST F. LANGLEY. (Harvard Studies in Romance Languages. Vol. I). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1915. 8vo. xli + 150 pp.

It is pleasant and convenient to have the poetry of the Notary in one volume; pleasant for Mercury and convenient for his wife Philology. This edition has been favoured by both of those powers, and lovers of poetry and students of history and grammar will all find their advantage here. The verse of the early Sicilian school is not dead, nor is it disqualified, for us, by the 'new style' which put it out of fashion. It has its own discoveries, and its own music, and it survives, as the older French verse survives the criticism of the friends of Ronsard. There is a curious likeness in some of the early Italian verse to the ingenious thin *carillon* rhymes of the later Scottish Chaucerians—one thinks of Alexander Scott and Alexander Montgomerie:

> E se amasse voi, madonna mia
> e voi amaste meve
> e fosse neve, foco mi parria
> e notte e dia
> e tuttavia, mentre ch' avragio amore;
> e chi ben ama, ritorna in dolzore.

What is a 'colosmine'? The Oxford Dictionary ignores the word, but it is used by Rossetti translating the Notary: Canzone III in Mr Langley's edition: Amor non vole ch' io clami. Rossetti probably had the *Poeti del primo secolo* before him, where he read

> inviluti son li colosmini,

and wrote

> 'So is the colosmine
>   Now cheapened, which in fame
> Was once so brave and fine
>   But now is a mean gem.'

Mr Langley gives

> Inviluti so' i scolosmini
>   di quel tempo ricordato
>   ch' erano sì gai è fini;
>   nulla gioia non n' è trovato.
> [Codd. A, B: inviluto sono li scolosmini.]

But what are *scolosmini*? The scholiasts say 'a sort of precious stone,' which is obviously the meaning of 'colosmine'—but how, and what sort?

The termination of 'scolosmini' makes one think of a Greek participle; might it be 'stolismini' = ἐστολισμένοι, men in rich apparel? Or may we invent a Sicilian 'stolismo' from στολισμός, 'array,' 'decoration,' with 'stolismino' a diminutive in some special jeweller sense? From the context 'scolosmino' is not itself a precious stone; the *gioia*, jewel, belongs to it; jewelled tiara, necklace, girdle might be 'stolismo' or 'stolismino'; the diminutive might be something like 'carcanet' from 'carcan.'

'Aquila gruera' in Son. XVIII can hardly be the same thing as 'aquila guerrera.' 'Gruyer' in French means, of a falcon, 'flown at cranes,' like Chaucer's 'gentil hautein faucon heroneer'; and 'aquila gruera' needs no forced interpretation.

There are many interesting things in the art of Giacomo da Lentino; the eight syllable verse of Canzoni III and X is like the Spanish *redondilla* —not a common Italian measure in after times. Rossetti, translating III as quoted above, does not copy the original metre but takes the more usual, the more Italian six syllable metre (= *eptasillabum* in Dante *Vulg. Eloq.*).

Canz. IV uses the *neasillabum* which Dante will not allow in fine Italian poetry

Tanto siete maravigliosa
quand' i' v' ò bene afigurata
c' altro parete che 'ncarnata;
se non ch' io spero in voi, gioiosa.

Some rhythms in the *Discordo*, Giacomo's queer irregular poem, are more familiar in Spanish and English than in Italian of those early days;

Cà pur aspetando
in voi maginando
l' amor che 'n voi agio
mi stringe 'l coragio
avenente.

The 'Canzoni of disputed or doubtful authenticity' take up about 25 pages of Mr Langley's book. One is sorry to see Giacomo lose 'Membrando ciò ch' Amore':

For Love has made me weep
With sighs that do him wrong,
Since, when most strong my joy, he gave his woe.
I am broken, as a ship
Perishing of the song,
Sweet, sweet and long, the song the sirens know.

Rossetti follows his authorities, giving it to Giacomo. It is ascribed to 'Ser Guilglielmo Beroardi' in A = *Vaticano* 3793. Mr Langley thinks that it can hardly be Sicilian.

W. P. KER.

LONDON.

Poesías de Rafael Pombo (Edición oficial hecha bajo la dirección de Don Antonio Gómez Restrepo). Bogotá: Imprenta Nacional. 1916—1917. 2 vols. 8vo. xxxix + 379 pp. xii + 342 pp.

Traducciones poéticas de Rafael Pombo (Edición oficial hecha bajo la dirección de Don Antonio Gómez Restrepo). Bogotá: Imprenta Nacional. 1917. 8vo. xxxiv + 300 pp.

Fábulas y Verdades de Rafael Pombo. Bogotá: Imprenta Nacional. 1916. 8vo. 387 pp.

The name of the Colombian poet Rafael Pombo deservedly occupies a conspicuous place in the literary history of Spanish America. His verses, hitherto dispersed in periodicals not always easy of access, are now for the first time collected in book form; the original lyrics occupy two large octavo volumes, a third volume contains interesting translations in verse, and in the fourth are fables and apologues—original or otherwise—which reveal a characteristic aspect of Pombo's many-sided talent. This issue is published in accordance with an act passed by the Colombian Congress in 1912, not long after the poet's death (it may be remarked incidentally that public funds have often been put to less noble uses in various South American countries). To the Colombian Academy the law assigns the duty of supervising the publication; that Academy has been well-advised in deputing the editorial work to one of its most eminent members—D. Antonio Gómez Restrepo, a scholar of established repute who, as happy chance would have it, was likewise Pombo's executor. It may be said without hesitation that the result is extremely satisfactory. Sr. Gómez Restrepo aims at completeness, and by arranging the poems in chronological order, he exhibits the progress of Pombo's intellectual evolution: as the editor puts it, we are enabled to 'follow more easily the trajectory described by the poet's mind.' Thanks to the wealth of material and to the dates supplied, we are at last in a position to estimate Pombo's powers as a craftsman, to strike the true balance between his merits and defects, and to differentiate the period of his zenith from that of his occultation. The test is severe, but Pombo survives it. He had something to say, was often a master of his instrument, and had no paralyzing respect for artistic traditions which, though still paramount, were in truth (as he perceived) exhausted. It must, however, be admitted that his taste was not impeccable and that he tends at whiles to extravagance. These four large volumes help us to form a clearer image of a poet whose work indicates the direction of the literary currents prevalent in South America during the latter half of the nineteenth century. Every literary work, as we are told, is essentially autobiographical. Assuredly this saying holds true with respect to Pombo. He told the Spanish-speaking world what he was and what he felt, and to his impulsive, ingenuous candour we owe a record of mental phases, patently inconsistent but unquestionably sincere. The abundant chronological details furnished by Sr. Gómez Restrepo are so illuminating that we could wish a date were attached to every poem in the collection; such information is invaluable to the critic and the biographer.

It appears that Pombo began writing verses at the age of thirteen, and it is worth noting that his three earliest poems are inspired by patriotism, love and mistrust of society. These three themes never lost their interest for him: on them his emotional existence was based. At eighteen he underwent the first of his innumerable disillusions: he fell in love and was not taken seriously. On November 7, 1853, he wrote a poem to commemorate his twentieth birthday; here he speaks of his life as a 'blank book in which you can read only the number of the pages,' and describes himself as one 'who has not died, neither has he lived.' During this year, while travelling in New Granada, he gave the first intimation of his defiant attitude to the established order; in a famous poem, *La Copa de Vino*, he champions a lady who, owing to slander, had been sent to Coventry 'by unjust society, that market of crime.' As far back as 1854 he manifests a liking for long alexandrines and hexameters, for the rippling chimes of *esdrjúulos*, as well as a weakness (of which he was never to be wholly free) for gongoresque conceits and obscurities. In the autumn of 1855 Pombo journeyed to New York where he made acquaintance with poets and composers of diverse nationalities. Here, shortly after his arrival, he conceived an imperious passion which left a permanent impress on him, and though, as he informs us, his attachment never ceased to be platonic, his Egeria (whose name escaped him in a moment of juvenile indiscretion) thought it wiser to go northward out of range of the flame which he had unintentionally kindled.

Pombo's best love-poems, which are known and have made him known from New York to Buenos Aires, were composed at this stage of his passionate pilgrimage. *Edda*—a series of poems purporting to be the confidences of a woman whose love was unrequited—is dated November 3, 1855. Though *La Hora de Tinieblas* is not, strictly speaking, a love-poem, the note of a baffled passion is audible above its gusts of wild despair; those stanzas, dated September 16, 1855, and cast in the popular form of *décimas*, are redolent of Byron and Espronceda: Pombo once more inveighs against society and life, refurbishing immemorial texts on the vanity of the world and the absurdities which encompass us. At this moment he was apparently prepared to 'remould the very scheme of things entire.' He recanted later. He clung steadfastly to his belief in the invisible, and, in 1857, when his wounds began to heal, wrote *Alpha y Omega*, as though impelled to proclaim the basic formulae of his creed. To Sr. Gómez Restrepo he confided that *La Hora de Tinieblas* was the outcome of 'a crisis of exasperation due to physical disease.' This is easy to believe. The accents of despair do not characterize Pombo's most typical utterances. The strenuous stridency of his invective fails to overwhelm. His temperament was not fundamentally insurgent. When success came to him in his later years, his political ideals were those of authority, order and tradition; his mutinous instincts displayed themselves solely within the sphere of prosody. As the end drew nearer and it became evident that the trees in the orchard no longer bowed to proffer the ambrosia of their empurpled fruit[1], he accepted uncomplainingly fate's decree and penned a sonnet which ranks amongst the best of its kind in any language.

Critics, in dealing with Pombo's conception of nature, have classified him as a Romantic. This is too indefinite to be satisfying. Being what he was, and living when he did, Pombo was naturally in spiritual communion with the leaders of Romanticism. Nevertheless, he cannot be regarded as a 'descriptive' poet. Though his attitude to the physical world varied from time to time, the fact emerges that, when he found nature irresponsive to human grief, his sympathy withered. Speaking generally, it may be said that he was much less interested in the external aspects of the mute disdainful universe than in the relations between human beings. This is exemplified in *El Niágara* where we might expect an attempt at word-painting. Pombo does not even try to suggest the appearance of what he calls an 'unfathomable sea'; the huge waterfall serves as a pretext to develop the poet's philosophic views on the world, on the destiny of man and his inherent perfidy. Recalling his personal sufferings, Pombo denounces the 'monster' man—that 'viper poisonous to body and soul.' Nature is transformed into 'a child, eternally innocent and frank, the best nurse bestowed on man by heaven.' And, before leaving the cataract, Pombo perceives the vision of the one woman whom he seems to have loved. Much as he professed to spurn the human race, man had for him an undying fascination. With incomparable zest he describes our acts, our natural relations, our incurable imbecilities, our rare heroic deeds; the serener, immutable manifestations of nature are treated more perfunctorily. This appears in *Las Americanas en Broadway*, in *Bembuco*, a poem commemorating the charm of the popular music of the native Colombians, and in *La Casa del Cura*, a *genre* painting no less faithful than delicate. A philosopher in essence, Pombo is more akin to Leopardi than to Coleridge or Wordsworth. In his poems he is chiefly concerned with his personal raptures and woes; he could, however, render with a fine tenderness and consummate effect, the joys and sorrows of his fellow-creatures (especially when these fellow-creatures were women). Bachelor though he was, few poets who have written in Spanish have depicted with equal insight, certainty of touch and sensitive sympathy, the happiness of married life. That he was no less successful in transcribing the tragedy of bereavement is proved by his *Elegía* on the death of Antonio Ospina.

B. SANÍN CANO.

LONDON.

Russian Poets and Poems. By N. JARINTZOV. Vol. I. Classics. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell. 1917. 8vo. xxxix + 318 pp.

Readers of Madame Jarintzov's earlier books, *Russia—the Country of Extremes* and *The Russians and their Language*, will be prepared for something unconventional and interesting, if not 'academic,' when she treats in what she calls her 'simple talk' of the poets and poetry of her country. The book under notice contains more or less brief accounts of the nine chief or 'classic' Russian poets of the nineteenth century and their work, together with selections from their poems rendered into English verse preserving, so far as possible, the original metre and giving the exact sense of the original with as little amplification or distortion as the difficulties of the task allowed. In her Introduction, which is all we can notice here, Madame Jarintzov has much that is interesting to say about the peculiar difficulties facing the would-be translator of Russian poetry into English verse. She holds that this task should be undertaken by a Russian rather than by an English-speaking person, or preferably, that while 'the first start and the bulk of work of translating poetry should be in the hands of one in whose mother-tongue it has been originally written...his, too, is the right of judgment when it comes to the last filigree touches of the work. But there is one stage in between, and that is where the important help of "the foreigner" comes in.' Following out her idea, Madame Jarintzov has engaged some of her friends, including 'a young English poet,' to help her in her task of persuading the English language, with its 'terrible stumbling-blocks,' to mould itself on the free-moving, multi-vertebrate Russian. In the specimens which she provides of this division of labour we may test its value, and to speak frankly, we do not find it satisfactory. The versions certainly preserve, after a fashion, the original metres and they are generally accurate, but they are not likely to please English readers. They lack beauty, even the beauty of elegance, harmony, finish, being somewhat crude and undistinguished, at times even un-English. But as Madame Jarintzov has in view Russian as well as English readers, and feels sure that her fellow-countrymen will approve of her method and its results, we can hardly quarrel with her. We ourselves would prefer Russian poetry to be translated by an Englishman or Englishwoman, scholarly, well read in English poetry as well as in Russian poetry, not unused to writing English verse, and familiar with Russia and its people. Madame Jarintzov has much to say that is interesting and hardly to be found elsewhere on the difference between Russian and English verse-technique and poetic word-material. In her insistence on preserving in every case the original metre she fails to realise that the English ear and the Russian ear in the matter of verse-rhythm have received a very different education. Thus the dactylic rhythm, which abounds in Russian poetry, is comparatively rare in English, consequently its effect when used in any given poem is not at all the same in the two languages. We make no apology for quoting some of the observations made by Madame Jarintzov in her Introduction, as they will probably interest students of metrics. 'Scanning,' she says, 'is a very strict master with our classical verse. In English you seem to determine the metrical value of a word by its conversational stress; the metre with your best poets is not so much "metre" as it is "lilt": while we Russians demand from the scanning of any metre an absolutely even succession of beats, to which you could either march or dance.' Madame Jarintzov has an ingenious explanation of the contrast between the licence of the English and the strictness of the Russian rhythmical movement. The Russian, she thinks, craves orderliness, 'stateliness in beauty' as a contrast to the unregulated freedom 'which permeates Russian life in spite of the grip of officialdom.' The orderliness and regularity of English private life has found 'an outlet for the instinctive human vein of personal freedom in the licentious world of the English versification.' Of the metre of the Russian folk-poetry we are told that 'it is absolutely different from the Western *vers libre*...The modern Western "free verse" is so unnatural to the national Russian poetic instinct that even our modernists, who are so keen on anything new, very seldom play with it. It will not live long with us.' Madame Jarintzov's 'unacademic' book is so interesting that we look forward to its successor, which is, we are told, to deal with the quite modern Russian poets such as Brusov, Ivanov, Sologub and others, who have made so many bold experiments in metre and language.

---

[1] Los gajos del pomar ya no diblegan
Para mí sus purpúreas ambrosías. (1890.

W. J. SEDGEFIELD.

MANCHESTER.

MINOR NOTICE

Many students of English Literature will be grateful for the series edited by Professor W. D. Howe, of which two specimen volumes are before us, *Burns, How to know him* edited by Professor W. A. Neilson of Harvard, and *Matthew Arnold, How to know him* edited by Professor S. P. Sherman of Illinois (Indianopolis, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1917). Volumes on Browning, Carlyle, Dante, Defoe, Stevenson, Wordsworth are also out, and others on The Bible, Dickens, Emerson, Hawthorne, Ibsen, Lamb, Lowell, Tennyson, Whitman are in preparation. The special feature of the books seems to be the interweaving of a biographical and critical monograph with a tolerably large anthology. A young student who reads one of these volumes will get to know the writer of whom it treats in a far more satisfactory fashion than by reading ever so much biography or criticism *in vacuo*. One must hope however that this volume will not become an end in itself, but will stimulate the student to turn from it to the author it has illustrated and find fresh food outside of the ration here provided. The specimen volumes on Burns and Matthew Arnold seem to us excellent. In the former the proportion of anthology to critical matter is larger than in the latter: one is surprised however that no use is made of Burns' 'Vision' or his Epistles to J. Lapraik and W. Simpson in which he tells us so much of himself and of his aims as a poet. There is probably no better account anywhere of Matthew Arnold's 'Weltanschauung' and its different manifestations than this given by Professor Sherman.

G. C. M. S.

VOLUME XIII JULY, 1918 NUMBER 3

THE DATE OF 'LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST.'

Love's Labour's Lost offers remarkably little concrete evidence for a precise fixing of the limits of its date. So recent and competent an authority as the *N. E. D.* cites it as 1588 and other competent critics have put it as late as 1596. Present-day opinion tends to settle on about 1590, solely because metrical and aesthetic considerations in general demand an early date, and this is the earliest which seems to harmonise with the one topical allusion which has been generally accepted as bearing on the date—viz. the adoption of the names of the characters from those of the leaders in the French civil wars of 1589—1593. There are, however, one or two fairly clear references or general difficulties which do not harmonise with 1590, and scholars who have accepted these have still maintained 1590 as the date of the play and alleged the disturbing evidence as due to insertions and revisions of a later date: their plea has been generally admitted, because it goes beyond all question that the play was revised.

But there are two radical weaknesses in this chronological scheme. Firstly, as we shall see, the revision seems to have been of such a nature as to preclude our regarding it as the occasion of inserted allusions, etc. Secondly, the determining factor in this scheme is the metrical and aesthetic evidence, and it seems to us that the particular literary quality of the play itself hardly justifies an absolute reliance on considerations of this nature; to some extent it involves a confused application of canons, valid only in qualities unconsciously representing the stage of attainment at a particular moment, to qualities deliberately and purposely varied from what is at that moment the normal: it is somewhat as if Shakespeare's metrical level at the period of *Hamlet* should be judged by reckoning the Player's declamation and the play within the play as the normal type.

It seems, then, that the question of the date of *L. L. L.* needs further examination. The most unsatisfactory feature of the problem is the lack of definite and concrete evidence to act as a foundation and a check for the more or less subjective evidence, which has so far carried the issue. It is particularly unfortunate that the only cogent and generally accepted allusion which has availed for this purpose may apparently be valid for such relatively wide limits as 1589 to 1593 or indeed to 1598. We have recently, however, been lucky enough to discover a hitherto unnoticed allusion which gives us a more precise starting point—the allusion to Sir William Segar's (?) *Booke of Honor and Armes*, 1590 (see *M. L. R.* XII, pp. 76—78). The play then cannot date earlier than 1590 and may be later: indeed the particular reference has led us to suspect a somewhat later date. Segar's categories of 'causes' seem to have been original, and Armado's reference to them would be unintelligible unless they were generally known to Shakespeare's audience: and even if that original audience consisted mainly of courtiers, we may reasonably allow some little time for the diffusion of Segar's code.

We propose then, in the following paper, to review the whole problem of the date of the play. Some, perhaps much, of the material used in the argument is, of course, not original. But it has generally been modified in detail and in scope; and at least, it has not been used before with its present implication.

At the outset, we must reserve one matter for later consideration. We know that the play was revised: hence it is always open to object that any dateable piece of evidence is due to insertion at the time of the later revision. For the time being we shall generally assume that any passages of the play in which we find date-evidence are from the original draft: and then we shall later return to the problem of the possibility of their being due to later insertion.

I. ECHOES OF THE FRENCH CIVIL WAR.

Since Sir Sidney Lee's article in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (1880), it has been universally conceded that the names of Navarre, Biron, Longaville, and Dumain point to a period of time during which, or immediately following which, these were the protagonists in the French civil wars, i.e. 1589—1593 or a little later[1]. As the action of the play has no discoverable resemblance whatever to any historic incident of that time, it is strange that Shakespeare should have used names with immediate and general associations of their own quite irrelevant to the issue of the play. If his object were merely to give the play a French colour, one would have expected the choice of some remoter names, which would have been less liable to produce confusion. Still Shakespeare does use these contemporary names. Was the choice of them his own, and if so, why did he choose them?

---

[1] Sir Sidney Lee thinks that these French names were added in the revision of the play shortly before 1598. We do not accept his inference. The names of the nobles could have had little topical interest after 1593 at the latest. Moreover, his references to the appearance of Biron in Chapman's plays of 1605, do not, as he thinks, imply that the original of the Biron of *L. L. L.* persisted so long in popular imagination. Chapman's Biron is the son of Shakespeare's, the father being killed in 1592. And his death in that year would make his introduction for topical moment in 1598 still less probable. Further, that evidence in the play, which suggests that the French names represent a second and not a first choice, occurs consistently in the early part of the play, and in that part only, thus making it likely that the substitution was made whilst the play was being written, i.e. before the later acts were written.

There is some evidence (especially the reference to Cupid's killing of Katherine's sister in v, 2 and the elaborate details of the financial dispute of ii, 1) which has been taken to point to an undiscovered literary source of the play. Yet, if this source ever existed, the very evidence which has led to the supposal of its existence seems to make it highly improbable that the characters in it had the same names as those in the play: Katherine's sister was probably a chief character in its main plot, and a contemporary king and his nobles would hardly be suitably introduced as minor actors in a bye-plot; nor does the financial dispute easily fit itself to Henry of Navarre, but rather seems to have been incorporated from some other setting and forcibly saddled on Navarre. Other considerations still further increase the improbability of the occurrence of Shakespeare's names in the possible source. If they did so occur, we must admit the source as contemporary in origin with the play, and in that case our complete ignorance of it is less explicable still. Further we can hardly imagine that the exceptionally strange setting in which we find Dumain was due to the source; if it were, to its exceptional strangeness we should have to add the further strangeness of its perpetuation in the adaptation. And lastly, textual considerations would seem to place the issue beyond doubt by giving us concrete evidence that the names we find in the play were not the ones originally chosen whether by the author of the possible source or by Shakespeare himself in his first thoughts. The Q.—printed in all probability from Shakespeare's MS.[1]—in the early scenes, and in them only, frequently has *Ferdinand* in the speech-allocations and stage-directions where *King* (Henry of Navarre) is necessary. The Q. printer undoubtedly had authority for these readings which occur frequently and clearly: they must have occurred in Shakespeare's MS., and therefore represent his first name for the king. But this Ferdinand could not possibly have stood for Henry of Navarre, for no Englishman could have been ignorant of his name. And so it looks as if Shakespeare had begun writing his play without intending to use topical names: but after a few scenes had been written, circumstances caused him to incorporate these topical names—and so to change the speech-allocation indications. But why, it may be asked, did it happen that Shakespeare made the substitution consistently with Biron and the other nobles, leaving the original indications only in the King's speeches in the early scenes? The explanation seems easy. The usual and simplest indication for the royal character is the titular one—King, in which form it most frequently occurs in the play and without exception in the later acts. As Shakespeare used this most frequently, and as it would obviously not need alteration but could stand either for the original Ferdinand or for the substituted Henry, whose name never occurs, so the dramatist omitted to notice that in his earlier scenes he had put the personal name which needed alteration when the names were changed[1]. And he was notoriously careless with his MS. alterations. The fact that, even in the later scenes, the Princess occurs in stage directions frequently as *Queen* would seem to confirm this supposition. There is no question of altering her personal name for historical and topical considerations, since she is never given one: she probably was queen in the original intention, and could indeed have remained so without incongruity—but, Navarre admitted, Princess is a slightly preferable appellation. Hence the casual alteration in places. We may take it, then, that Shakespeare himself deliberately chose these names.

---

[1] See *The Library*, Oct. 1917, pp. 355—370.

Why did he do so? The only possible motive is that in this topical play, he chose them because circumstances caused them to give the play an added topical interest. In doing so, he risked possible confusion of the dramatic and the real personages, but he evidently decided that the attraction of the topical names was sufficiently great to counterbalance this. And indeed, if his audience had the real persons in their mind during the performance, there is little beyond Dumain's attachment to the King's party to arouse a sense of disturbed propriety[2]. We conclude then that Shakespeare deliberately chose these names for their topical attraction. Of course, these names would have had some interest for Englishmen at any time between 1589 and 1593: indeed, as we have seen, Sir Sidney Lee extends the period to 1598. But it seems to us that we can go more deeply and by a consideration of the force and nature of these interests discover particular circumstances which will limit these dates more precisely. First of all, the topical interest was so strong that it not only gave Shakespeare the thought of incorporating the names, but it urged him to substitute them for names already chosen and in part adopted. Secondly, the nature of his use of these topical references, especially his portrait of Biron, points to a particular source for his information which would only be attainable at a particular time. But the general truth of Shakespeare's portrait of Biron and the implied general knowledge of this character which alone would make it topically attractive, point to a period when this knowledge had been diffused by the talk of the returned expeditionary force which had served under him[1]. It seems to us that these considerations will justify a more detailed examination of the French war, and that in its turn the examination will bring us to the more precise limitation of date of the play. It should enable us to see when English interest was really strong and compelling, and when circumstances could give it the substance it passes on to the dramatist.

---

[1] See the first footnote under section VII of this article (to follow).

[2] It may be that even this reservation need not be made. In Shakespeare's day the most obvious source of French news both for him and for his audience would be the talk of returned soldiers: and we shall see that the portrait of Biron gives a particular confirmation of this general likelihood. The English contingent in Brittany in 1592 fought in conjunction with and for some time under Marshal Daumont. It is not at all difficult to imagine a confusion in soldiers' ears between De Mayenne and Daumont: at all events it is easier to imagine this than to find a reason for including De Mayenne in the King's fellowship. Moreover it is frequently stated that De Mayenne is often found in Elizabethan references as Dumaine. I have never found him referred to with the *Du* prefix—but several times as Demaine.

Furnivall (*Old Spelling Shakespeare* 1904) apparently thinks that in 1589 the war was of sufficiently topical interest to explain the use of the names. He quotes Stow to the effect that in Sept. 1589 a thousand Londoners and a similar quota from some other shires (4000 in all) were sent to Henry's aid under Peregrine Bertie, Lord Willoughby. But we have many reasons for refusing to believe that this particular expedition can be accepted as the necessary evidence. In the first place, it was disastrous; it lasted three months only, but in December 1589 only one thousand of the original 4000 returned alive, and they were loud in their complaints that Henry had taken no care of them and that there had been no co-operation between the French and the English armies. Willoughby himself wrote: 'In my life, nothing ever grieved me more, but I must endure God's will[2].' As *L. L. L.* is certainly not earlier than 1590, the author could, of course, by then have gleaned information from returned soldiers: but that information could hardly have made topical references to Henry and his generals palatable. And further still, as the force complained bitterly of the lack of co-operation and indeed never seems to have served with the French at all, its members could not have passed on to Shakespeare any information about Biron, whom they never met and of whom they had had no opportunity of gaining knowledge through his associates and soldiers. And finally, as we shall see, we do not believe that English interest in the war was at this time sufficiently compelling to suggest any topical reference.

---

[1] C. E. Browne (*Athenaeum*, 30 Sept. 1876) says that Biron had been ambassador in London. His embassy, however, seems to have left absolutely no impression on literature, and cannot be regarded as the source of Shakespeare's knowledge of him.

[2] State Papers, France; vol. xx, f. 174, etc. Quoted from J. B. Black, *Elizabeth and Henry IV*, 1589—1603. Oxford, 1914, p. 17.

Neither the English populace nor the English court felt themselves concerned vitally: throughout 1589 and 1590 their interest was lukewarm. It remained so until Henry's opponents were leagued with and subservient to the Spaniards. Thus in the summer of 1590 Elizabeth refused to send succours to Henry who, despite his victory at Ivry, was continually appealing to her. In August 1590 she wrote to him lightheartedly that she expected to hear any moment of his capture of Paris and begged him to accept some of her hunting trophies[1]. In the autumn of 1590, however, Henry's army 'broke' on learning that the Leaguers with a Spanish army were in the field. But even yet England only partly realised her concern in this. In November, Elizabeth answered another appeal by mere evasions, although a handful of English volunteers (1000 in all) under Sir R. Williams went to Henry's aid: but even they acted independently of the French command. In Jan. 1591, however, Burghley was just beginning to realise how English interests were concerned. The Spaniards were attacking Brittany on the one side and Picardy on the other, thus endangering the Channel. Hence England took its first official part in the war in 1591. Williams was ordered to Dieppe with 600 men, and in April, Norreys with 4000 to Brittany. But once more these forces were to act under British, not French, command. We may say then that it was not until the spring of 1591 that even the English government found the French wars of compelling interest, and in fact, it was some time later before the English public regarded them as topics of the moment. For instance, we may presumably regard the works of Nashe and Harvey as types of the literary atmosphere of the day: we find in them not the slightest reference to the French wars nor to any event in them prior to those of the spring of 1591. And indeed we find but one single reference to Norreys' expedition: and as Norreys was in France up to 1593 even this reference is so general that later events may have occasioned it[2].

---

[1] Black, *op. cit.*, p. 26: 'Ce temps pendant je vous envoie partie du fruit de mes labeurs d'aujourd'hui ayant esté moy-mesme en la place ou la beste est tombée morte et en ay prins à premier essay.'

[2] Grosart's *Harvey*, I, 175.

But in July 1591 another expeditionary force was despatched to France with great acclamation. The choice of its commander created lively interest at court. Henry had specially requested that the leadership should be given to one of the most striking figures in London—Essex, the royal favourite. Elizabeth would not let him leave her presence at first: but three times he knelt before her for two hours and more, begging for the command. And finally, with great jubilation he obtained it[1]. Essex's expedition is the first which created a public stir: although he held the command only a few months, Harvey, writing, in Sept. 1592, refers only to 'the brave Earle of Essex' and 'woorthy Sir Iohn Norrice' as leaders in the war[2]. Moreover, the incidents of Essex's expedition added to this stir. At the outset, the expedition 'created a veritable sensation on its arrival in France[3]': but it was detained some time at Dieppe to the great irritation of the English and of Elizabeth herself.

Then in September Essex deliberately disregarded cautionary orders from home and plunged forward to Gournay to help Biron to capture the town. Finally he proceeded to Rouen. As early as June the French king had thrown some troops round that town, and he had aroused the liveliest interest in England by promising to gather a huge army for its complete investment. By December 1591 the siege was in progress, and Essex's army was taking its share. Elizabeth was unusually strenuous in her efforts to bring it to success, despatching further reinforcements, and appealing for more help to the German allies. This siege was really the event which gripped popular imagination in England. Thus the events of the French war which find casual mention in Nashe are precisely these of Essex's campaign: he mentions 'a dapper Jacke that hath been but over at Deepe,' 'the barricadoes of Gurney[4],' and 'a pioner before the walls of Roan[5].' Besides these, the only other incident he mentions is the siege of Guingan (Guingamp) in which Norreys, and not Essex, was concerned, in 1591. It seems, then, that we shall hardly expect—and in fact, do not find—casual references to the French wars before the end of 1591. Before passing on, we would point out also that Essex's expedition was the first which worked in concert with the French, and moreover, the first which came into contact with Biron. In August 1591 the French king specially appointed Biron to act as strategic adviser and liaison officer with the English. In September 1591, Essex marched inland from Dieppe to Gournay and joined forces with Biron, ultimately to proceed to Rouen.

---

[1] Black, *op. cit.*, pp. 42—44.

[2] Grosart, I, p. 175.

[3] Black, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

[4] Dr McKerrow implies that Gurnay was mentioned because of assault by De Mayenne in 1589. But we suggest that Biron and Essex's siege gave it its importance: moreover the dapper Jacke would hardly be in the attack on the barricadoes by De Mayenne's men.

[5] Nashe's *Works*, ed. McKerrow, I, p. 169.

As we have seen, England watched Rouen eagerly, so much so that Elizabeth thought Henry was not as vitally concerned as she herself: so she recalled Essex. But English troops still eagerly pressed the siege, until Henry's army broke before an overwhelming army under Parma and caused the abandonment of the attack. Thus what Henry lost in prestige in the summer of 1592, he made up for by arousing English sympathy: and this sympathy was stimulated by the English government, who saw a chance of advancing English interests through Henry's peril. We may say that the summer and autumn of 1592 marked the highest level of English public interest in the French wars; in that summer another contingent under Norreys was working in Brittany under Marshal Daumont; and in the same summer Elizabeth drove a hard bargain with Henry: in return for further English help, Henry ceded a walled town, port and harbour in Brittany, thus granting what had been the English objective from the outset. 'It would be difficult to point to a greater triumph of English diplomacy: the treaty established a maximum advantage in favour of England[1].'

We should imagine that this would be the time when topical allusions would be most easily occasioned. And indeed, we are not limited solely to conjecture. Harvey writes to Bird in Sept. 1592:

> The next weeke, you may happily have a letter of such French occurrences, and other intelligences, as the credible relation of inquisitive frendes, or imployed straungers, shall acquaint me withall. That most valorous, and brave king wanteth no honourable prayses, or zealous prayers. Redoubted Parma was never so matched: and in so many woorthy histories, aswell new, as olde; how few comparable either for Vertue, or Fortune? The Spanyard, politique inough, and not over-rashly audatious, will bee advised before he entangle himselfe with more warres attonce: knowing how the brave Earle of Essex, woorthy Sir John Norrice, and their valiant knightes, have fought for the honour of England: and for the right of Fraunce, of the Low countries, and of Portugall. Thrise happy Fraunce; though how unhappy Fraunce, that hath...such invincible Handes to fight for thee; that will either recover thee most mightily, or die for thee most honourably. Were I of sufficient discourse, to record the valiauntest, and memorablest actes of the world; I would count it a felicity, to have the oportunity of so egregious, and heroicall an argument: not pleasurably devised in counterfaite names, but admirably represented to the eie of France, and the eare of the world, in the persons of royall, and most puissant knightes: how singularlie worthy of most glorious, and immortal fame? Gallant wits, and brave pennes may honorably bethinke themselves[2].

At least one, then, of Elizabethan men of letters thought that the autumn of 1592 was ripe for an introduction of Henry and his nobles into literature. But circumstances soon changed: nobody fulfilled Harvey's pious hopes. In fact English interest was changing: Henry might still be acclaimed in April 1593 as 'the brave soldiour,' 'an impetuous whirlewind of warre,' etc.[1], but his approach to Rome naturally alienated English sympathy. He was 'converted' in July 1593. When that was fully known in England, he would be regarded from a totally different standpoint. 'Navarre wooes Roome,' says Harvey in his Gorgon sonnet annexed to the *New Letter* of Sept. 1593: possibly he wrote it when hostilities ceased and before he knew the full secession, or perhaps as he left London in July, he might have been ignorant of it even in September. At any rate, from the conversion we may date the time of a change which results in the picture of Frenchmen in *Henry V* being more palatable to an Elizabethan than that in *L. L. L.*

---

[1] Black, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

[2] Grosart, I, 174.

It seems to us, then, that the period following Essex's expedition was the earliest at which English interest was such as to give any value to topical allusions such as we have in the play. It seems improbable that the earlier lukewarm concern could have occasioned topical allusions, and we have found none at all in the works of typical literary men who do allude to the French war in 1592. At all events, it seems impossible that prior to the end of 1591 circumstances could have occasioned the deliberate substitution of names of French generals to obtain these topical allusions. And we have seen that apparently the most favourable time for such allusions was the latter part of 1592.

But we may proceed to a more decisive issue. Only Essex's expedition could have supplied the information which Shakespeare obviously had when he wrote *L. L. L.* It was the only force which could have known Biron. And we have independent evidence that the soldiers of Essex's contingent had been especially attracted by Biron, and moreover, particularly for the characteristics which are the outstanding qualities of the Biron of the play.

Sir Thomas Coningsby was with Essex, and in his *Journal of the Siege of Rouen*[2] he remarks on Biron's joining the English contingent and on his great popularity with it. 'The Marshall Biron comes presently [i.e. autumn 1591] downe to joyne with our forces to enterprise somethinge in theise quarters.' He goes on to tell of Biron's 'gallantrie and pleasantness,' of his merry tricks and witty sayings, and especially of his fondness for women. Shakespeare must have had his Biron from one of Essex's men. And he could not have got the information before

---

[1] Grosart's *Harvey*, II, p. 104.

[2] *Camden Miscellany*, p. 19.

1592. Moreover Nashe will let us see how the talk of the town ran in that year. 'Al Italionato is his talke,' he says of one type, '& his spade peake is as sharpe as if he had been a Pioner before the walls of Roan.' 'You shall see a dapper Iacke, that hath been but over at Deepe,...and saith, he hath adventured upon the Barricadoes of Gurney or Guingan, and fought with the yong Guise hand to hand[1].' We imagine, then, that Shakespeare got his information from a returned soldier of Essex's contingent. Coningsby will give us another item of independent confirmatory evidence. It is not easy to see what particular motive impelled Shakespeare to choose Longaville as one of the triumvirate of nobles in preference to other equally or better known generals of the campaigns. But the supposition that Shakespeare got his information from one of Essex's soldiers will give us an intelligible reason: for Coningsby informs us that the force was posted some considerable time near Longaville's estate; and thus Longaville's name would obtain a greater familiarity in the English soldier's mind[2].

Finally, in IV, i, 21—22 'See, see, my beauty will be saved by merit! O heresy in fair, fit for these days!' we have a clear reference to the activity of the anti-Reformation movement. It is slight and in itself admits of but the vaguest interpretation of 'these days.' But in a play of which Navarre is one of the chief characters, and in which we have found other evidence for fixing on 1592 as its date, it does not seem a hazardous supposition to imagine that the lines refer to the period of time when Henry was negotiating what to England was a matter of real consternation. In March 1592 the terms of the conversion were actually being discussed—and the project was in the public eye till its settlement in 1593.

Altogether, then, these French allusions suggest 1592 as the earliest date for *L. L. L.*: they make it probable that the latter part of that year was the actual time of composition[3].

(*To be concluded.*)

MANCHESTER. H. B. CHARLTON.

---

[1] McKerrow's *Nashe*, I, 169.

[2] It would thus seem that only Dumain's introduction is without tangible occasion: and this would support the suggestion given above, viz. that Dumain is a confused form of Daumont.

[3] When Harvey wrote the letter (quoted above) on Sept. 5, 1592, had he just heard something of the first performance or intended performance of a play in which the French King and his nobles appeared, but appeared nominally only? One would like to think so. But unfortunately, when he tells us the sort of 'argument' he would write, he probably contrasts it not with *L. L. L.*, but with a poem like the *Faery Queene*, in which 'heroicall' arguments *are* 'pleasurably devised in counterfaite names.' And although 'pleasurably devised in counterfaite names' could perhaps serve as a rough description of the *personae* of *L. L. L.*, it would not be the obvious interpretation of the words.

SPENSER'S 'BLATANT BEAST.'

In his report of his conversations with Ben Jonson, Drummond of Hawthornden mentions a paper of annotations which Spenser gave to Raleigh, and he says that his visitor added 'That in that paper Sir W. Raughly had of the Allegories of the Fayrie Queene by the Blating Beast the Puritans were understood.' This vexatious note has been on the carpet for three centuries, and only three years ago it found a literal defender in Mr George Harman who says unequivocally that the Blatant Beast 'no doubt, represents the malcontent Puritans and sectaries on that side,' and regards 'this construction' as 'obvious.' In the seventeenth century no one questioned it and it was matter of allusion to the Cavalier poets. Cleveland's lines hurled at the Puritans of his day are a good example:

> A libel is his dress, a Garb uncouth,
> Such as the Hue and Cry once purg'd at mouth.
> Scribbling Assassinate! thy Lines attest
> An ear-mark due, Cub of the Blatant Beast.
> Whose breath before 'tis syllabled for verse
> Is Blasphemy unfledg'd, a callow Curse.
> (*King's Disguise.*)

Dryden had the same interpretation in mind when he made the Hind say to the Panther:

> You learned this language from the blatant beast.
> (*Hind and Panther,* I, 229.)

In the twentieth century the contrary interpretation has secured the balance of authority and in a paragraph summing up the view of recent scholarship Mr De Sélincourt says:

> Jonson's statement to Drummond is as misleading as most of his remarks about Spenser....There is no ground for assuming that Spenser ever changed his mind as to the value of the ideal for which the better Puritans stood. It is truer to say that the Puritan party developed in practice tendencies with which as a poet and thinker he could have no sympathy.

Our difficulty in understanding the Blatant Beast is because the doubt over the reference to the Puritans which had its origin in Jonson's chance remark to Drummond and to which the subsequent history of political Puritanism added adventitious interest, has obscured the nature of the Beast. It is really the most transparent of all the characters in the political allegory of the *Faerie Queene*, and it is the only one which Spenser himself interpreted. In several passages in the last canto of Book VI he makes it clear that, whether or not the Beast shadows the particular kind of calumniation of which the Puritans had been guilty, it certainly shadows a host of various kinds of calumniation committed by men of all professions in a century when libel did its worst in European politics. Stanzas xxviii and xl are as explicit as commentaries. The Beast

> ...spake licentious words, and hatefull things
> Of good and bad alike, of low and hie;
> Ne Kesars spared he a whit, nor Kings,
> But either blotted them with infamie,
> Or bit them with his banefull teeth of injury.

Sir Calidore succeeded in muzzling him and shutting up his 'blasphemous tongue'

> For never more defaming gentle Knight,
> Or unto lovely Lady doing wrong;

but he broke away.

> So now he raungeth through the world againe,
> And rageth sore in each degree and state;
> Ne any is, that may him now restraine,
> He growen is so great and strong of late,
> Barking and biting all that him doe bate,
> Albe they worthy blame or cleare of crime:
> Ne spareth he most learned wits to rate,
> Ne spareth he the gentle Poets rime,
> But rends without regard of person or of time.

In the closing cantos of the two last books of his great allegory Spenser was shooting at larger game than the recent Marprelate tracts or any of the other scurrilous attacks on Elizabeth's ecclesiastical settlement which, rightly or wrongly, had begun to be attributed popularly to the Puritans. The Marprelate pamphlets were a single and as yet hardly recognized tongue in the mouth of the Blatant Beast,

> And therein were a thousand tongs empight,
> Of sundry kindes and sundry quality.

In the sixteenth century such tongues were almost the only influence in politics, and religious bigotry combined with factional jealousy and personal hatred made Elizabeth's position, as head of a schismatic church and inheritor of a kingdom through a condemned adulteress, peculiarly vulnerable. Her reign was a long struggle with her calumniators, sometimes by force of arms or diplomacy, when they happened to be nations, sometimes by statutes and prosecutions, when they happened to be unpopular 'Seminaries' or Jesuits, and sometimes by repayment in their own coin, when they chanced to be Martinists who could not be found out and who preached a doctrine dangerously acceptable to Elizabeth's very protestant and very bourgeois England. The most dangerous peril that beset her was Pius V's bull of excommunication. All of the conspiracies in behalf of the Queen of Scots sprang from it; all of the prosecutions of Roman Catholic clergymen were founded upon it; the descent of the Armada was an attempt to enforce it; and to Englishmen in the last decade of the Queen's reign it must have seemed to be the keystone in the arch of calumny which had supported the enemies of their country's peace. Between 1560 and 1590 all of the chief ministers of state had to contend against slanderers, and the courtiers lived in dread of the day when some libel would be invented to their undoing. Camden mentions a 'Treatise of Treason' published by plotters disappointed in their

> Lewd hopes, and accusing Bacon Lord Keeper of the Great Seale, and Cecyl Lord Burghley Lord Treasurer of England of treason against their Country, to worke them into hatred with the Prince and people[1].

The Queen proclaimed the book 'a meere slander, maliciously forged to deprive the realm of its councillors.' In 1584 she found it necessary to issue another such proclamation in defence of the courtier who stood nearest her throne, and her mandate, though reinforced by Sir Philip Sidney's *Defence* of his uncle, was not strong enough to suppress all the copies of *Leycester's Commonwealth* or to prevent the libel from teaching Englishmen in the sixteenth century what to think of Robert Dudley, as, thanks to Sir Walter Scott, it taught them what to think of him in the nineteenth century. If there was any question whether the reign when the author of a libel was made a capital offender and the printer and seller were made liable to mutilation was an extremely scurrilous period, Elizabeth herself has removed all doubt in the public proclamations that she has left. In one of them, issued in 1585, she said in conclusion to her manifesto announcing Leicester's expedition for the relief of the Netherlands:

> Malicious toungs may utter their cankred conceits, as at this daie the world aboundeth with blasphemous reports in writings and infamous libels, as in no age the divel hath more abounded with notable spirits replenished with all wickednesse to utter his rage against the professors of the Christian religion.

As Spenser looked back over the years which had passed since Henry VIII broke with Clement VII he saw a few great forces at work in English history, and he represented them in his allegory. Some of them were making for the honour of England and the English church, and he gave them places in his romance as the Red Cross Knight, the type of the royal power as the Defender of the Faith, or as Artegal, the exemplar of the errant Justice of England defending the helpless Netherlanders against Spanish tyranny, restoring the usurped crown of France to Henry of Navarre, and slowly tranquillizing Ireland by such administrators as Sir Henry Sidney, Lord Grey, and Sir John Perot. Two of them were enemies of his church and nation, and he represented them as Archimago, type of the many treacherous agents of Rome, and as the Blatant Beast, type of the ignorant, vindictive malice of the mob which at times of religious or political excitement is always at the beck of Envy and Detraction in high places.

---

[1] R. N. Gent's translation of Camden's *Annals*, B. Fisher, London, 1635, p. 167.

Since Luther's revolt popular passion had been unchained in Europe and had gone about seeking whom it might devour under the name of heretic, papist, traitor, gentleman, atheist, or what not. To the finest minds, to the men who were the real reformers of the century, this was their greatest discouragement. Erasmus wrote in the *Lingua*,

> Circumferet quisque oculos suos, per domos privatas, per collegia, per monasteria, per aulas principum, per civitates, per regna, et compendio discet, quantam ubique pestem ingerat Lingua Calumniatrix.

Spenser revolted against this as intensely as Erasmus had done a few years before him, and, with as clear vision as Erasmus, he saw that the evil was spread through all classes in society and that it tainted all parties and creeds alike. In his allegory he described it without any reservations in the figure of the Blatant Beast. In the story of Serena and Timias he glanced at it in the form of backbiting at Court. His allusion may have been to the slanders against Sir Walter Raleigh at the time of his liaison with Frances Throckmorton, but there is no very valid reason for accepting this ingenious suggestion of Upton. Elizabeth's reign abounded with examples of the same kind. In the last stanzas of Book VI the Blatant Beast is represented as the ignorant enemy of scholarship and literature, and with rare tolerance Spenser recognized it as the spirit of the mobs which brought the cause of the Gueux into disrepute by their violence in the cathedral at Antwerp and injured the English reformation by their iconoclasm in London:

> ...into the sacred Church he broke,
> And robd the Chancell, and the deskes downe threw,
> And Altars fouled, and blasphemy spoke,
> And th' Images, for all their goodly hew,
> Did cast to ground.

In the rôle of image-breaker the Blatant Beast had its prototype in the beast vanquished and chained by Leo in *Orlando Furioso*, and, as the enemy of gentle knights and ladies which it was the quest of the Knight of Courtesy to subdue, it probably owed something to Malory's Glatysant. In the twelfth canto of Book V, where Spenser gives us his first conception of the Beast, it owes its suggestion to the monster of Plato's *Republic.* It was under this form, I think, that the Blatant Beast first arose in Spenser's imagination. As he wrote the Fifth Book Spenser kept his eye on the Platonic Commonwealth, and when he told the story of the qualified success of the Knight of Maidenhead who carried Gloriana's justice to Irena, he found an allegorical figure ready to hand to typify the scandalous libels which had thwarted all of Elizabeth's lieutenants. He had known about those libels all his life. In 1579, when his acquaintance with Sir Philip Sidney began, he found his patron engaged in a contest with the critics of Sir Henry Sidney's *régime* in Ireland, and even meditating a duel with the most unscrupulous of them, the Earl of Ormond. Between 1580 and 1595 he saw a succession of Deputies succumb to the misrepresentations of the envy and detraction of English courtiers supported by the indiscriminate complaints of Irish malcontents. While he was writing the Fifth Book Sir John Perot, the Deputy for whom the *Present State of Ireland* seems to indicate that he had perhaps the keenest admiration, was being tried on a trumped-up charge of treason in London after a distinguished career of many years in Ireland, and before the Book was finished the old soldier had died, condemned, in the Tower. The charges were so libellous that Burleigh himself regretted the verdict in guarded language which Camden reports; 'Hatred the more unjust it is,' he said in words which might mean much or nothing at all, 'so much the more sharpe.' Sir Henry Sidney was four times Lord Deputy in Ireland, and Sir John Davies testified[1] early in James I's reign that, like the Knight of Justice,

> he left behind him many monuments of good government in the land,...caused divers good laws to be made, and performed sundry other services tending greatly to the reformation of the Kingdom,

while Holinshed adds that he

> would have brought to passe a farre greater increase if envie, spite, and malice...had not crossed him, and opposed themselves all that they could, by purse or credit, against his honorable, worthie, commendable services and desseins.

Sir Warham St Leger was another of Spenser's contemporaries in Ireland, who served as Sidney's lieutenant for years and was Deputy himself three times, but Hooker records[1] that each time

---

[1] *A Discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never subdued*, reprinted by Henry Morley, 1890, London, Routledge & Sons.

> the old practices were renewed, and many slanderous informations were made and inveighed against him, which is the fatall destinie, and inevitable to everie good governor in that land. For the more paines they take in tillage, the worse is their harvest; and the better be their services, the greater is the malice and envie against them; being not unlike a fruitfull apple tree, which the more apples he beareth, the more cudgels be hurled at him.

Political slander in the sixteenth century was

> A dreadfull feend, of gods and men ydrad.

In Spenser's Ireland it raged most furiously. The governors whom Elizabeth sent across St George's Channel were usually men well fitted to administer a province. Sir John Perot and Sir Warham St Leger were soldiers of the best kind; Lord Grey of Wilton was one of the most honourable and experienced noblemen in England; and Sir Henry Sidney was an ideal knight, measured either by the ancient standard of skill in arms, or by the more recent standards of chivalrous character and literary education which Castiglione had taught were the principal ornaments of knighthood. In Sir Henry Sidney Spenser recognized a man whom Plato himself might have chosen for a place among the rulers of his ideal commonwealth, and in whom he himself found a model of the gentleman which it was the object of his poem to fashion.

The difficulty with Ben Jonson's note on the Blatant Beast is not that it tells a falsehood, but that it tells a very partial truth. It must obviously have been made with reference to that passage in Book V where the Beast, after having made havoc of all estates,

> ...to the Clergy now was come at last,
> In which such spoile, such havocke, and such thefte
> He wrought, that thence all goodnesse he bereft.

This passage was a stumbling-block to the eighteenth century commentators. In a note scribbled against it in the margin of his personal edition of Spenser, Thomas Warton queries with a curious attribution of bigotry to his author:

> One would think that he ought to praise the Blatant Beast for this. ...he is no favorer of superstitions...as in Abessa's story. Qu. Elizabeth against abbies...how must this please her?

Church, in his edition, proposed to alter the passage by reading 'daub'd' for 'rob'd' in stanza xxv, line 2, because the Blatant Beast was 'not a thief but a defamer.' Evidently the Beast seemed to him to be acting out of character, but the suggested change could scarcely have satisfied a mind which was not able to conceive Spenser as capable of regretting the excesses of his own party. There can be no doubt that under this figure Spenser was reflecting on all of the libels and outrages of bigotry against the property and priesthood of the Church in England, and that he was animadverting impartially on the wrongs of Henry VIII's suppression of the monasteries, the Protector Somerset's suppression of the chantries, and the excesses of the radical reformers in the 'Vestment' controversy and the 'Marprelate' controversy of Elizabeth's reign. He had known that unpleasant side of the Reformation from his Cambridge days, when Cartwright's party smashed the stained windows of the college chapels, and he had never sympathised with it. In 1576 Grindal was the leader of the moderate party among the reformers and he urged that unless Cartwright would modify his position he should be expelled from his professorship. It is significant that although the *Shepherd's Calendar* and *Mother Hubbard's Tale* prove that he agreed with most of Cartwright's opinions, Spenser seems to have chosen Grindal for his leader rather than the violent Margaret Professor of Divinity.

---

[1] Holinshed's *Chronicle*, Part II, p. 109.

It would be interesting to know whether in glancing at the 'Marprelate' controversy under the Blatant Beast, Spenser considered himself as taking a fling at the Puritans. Jonson told Drummond that he said definitely that 'the Puritans were understood,' and, unless good counter-evidence can be found, the testimony must stand. We know that Spenser did give Raleigh the paper which Jonson quoted as his authority, and we can be quite certain that such a paper must have contained some reference to the Blatant Beast. Jonson must have reported its contents either rightly or wrongly, and as it is unlikely that Spenser included negative information, the probability is that if he mentioned the Puritans at all, he made the statement which Jonson attributed to him. There would be nothing inconsistent in such a statement if Spenser made it. It is customary to call Spenser a Puritan, and in the sense that he belonged to the reforming wing of the English church the name is rightly given to him, but it must always be remembered that the reformers numbered men of widely divergent views, so divided among themselves that Grindal could demand Cartwright's deprivation and Cox could refer to the more violent reformers as the second antichrist. Puritan was a name which they did not accept until after Spenser's death. In 1602 Josias Nichols, 'a faithfull Minister of the Ghospell,' published *A Plea of the Innocent, wherein is averred That the ministers and people falslie termed Puritanes, are injuriously slandered* *for enemies or troublers of the state*: and a section of the book was devoted to prove that the name of Puritan had been 'unjustlie' applied

> to all those, who faithfullie and in the feare of God have sought reformation (howsoever for that cause they have bene, and are untrulie so called).

Nichols says that the name became popular about 1568. Fuller (*Church Hist.*, IV, p. 327) says definitely that it came into use about 1563. Camden records that shortly after the first 'Admonition to the Parliament,' for presenting which Field and Wilcox were committed to Newgate on October 2, 1572, the reformers 'began presently to be called by the envious name of Puritans.' There can be no doubt that, when Spenser wrote, the name had been popularly used to designate the reform party in a loose way for more than thirty years, but it seems equally clear that the reformers themselves had not adopted it, and that it was still a term of reproach hurled at them by the friends of Elizabeth's ecclesiastical establishment and also bandied between the factions within their own ranks. During the 'Marprelate' controversy the Martinists and Puritans were confounded by their enemies, but there was really no sympathy between them. Nichols represented the attitude of most of the Puritan clergy when he called the author of the 'Marprelate' pamphlets

> a foolish iester, who termed himself Martin Marprelate and his sons,...and cast forth much beastlie filth into the faces of honest men: to the great contempt of Christs Gospel. ...The blame (he added) lighted upon us, and we by it obtained a new name in manie pulpittes (how justlie God knoweth) wee were called Martinists[1].

The 'Marprelate' tracts did not have the support of many of the reformers. Martin himself taunted;

> I am favored of all estates, the Puritans only excepted....The Puritans are angry with me. I meant the Puritan preachers. And why? Because I am too open, because I jest[2].

It was huge sport for reckless Martin. The moderate men might sigh over the scurrility that was bringing their party into disrepute and gird at the impudence which fastened the name 'Puritan' upon them more securely while in the same breath it created new prejudice against it. After the 'Marprelate' controversy the reformers had to contend with two unwelcome epithets, 'Puritan' and 'Martinist,' which they in their turn used of the extreme faction of their own party, but which their enemies applied to them indiscriminately.

Spenser probably never thought of himself as a 'Puritan'; he certainly would never have spoken of himself as such. The name was still a reproach when he was writing the last books of the *Faerie Queene*, and no man willingly accepted it. Since the days of the first 'Admonition to the Parliament' Camden tells us that it had been under the Queen's high displeasure and Spenser probably shared her prejudice against it and in his own mind reserved it for the bigoted coterie in his party,

---

[1] *Plea*, pp. 31—33.

[2] *Tracts*, p. 118.

> That ungracious crew, that faigned demurest grace.

It seems likely that they were included with the iconoclasts satirized by the Blatant Beast, and there is no reason why in explaining his allegory Spenser should not have said that 'by the Blatant Beast the Puritans were understood.'

MERRITT Y. HUGHES.

EDINBURGH.

DRYDEN'S 'MAC FLECKNOE.' A VINDICATION[1].

In the course of what he describes as stating the case for Dryden's authorship of *Mac Flecknoe* 'clearly and impartially,' Mr Babington cites Scott's opinion that 'there existed no contemporary poet to whom so masterly a production could have been ascribed.' From this sentence he has omitted the words '*even with remote probability*,' and with them, he seems to have given up all idea of dealing with such considerations as they suggest. He is free, therefore, to abstain from making any appeal to the 'ear' of those who are familiar with Dryden and Oldham, and need not attempt to explain how the latter, who in his published satires presses all sorts of words into the service as rhymes, and is very often content to get on without any, was able upon one occasion to achieve the almost uniform correctness of this poem.

Upon the broad question of its poetical qualities, Scott's view, in agreement with that of every competent critic who has ever written upon Dryden, will satisfy most people, but in the aspect of the case presented by Mr Babington, in which personal character is so seriously involved, something more may, and, in the writer's judgment, ought to be said.

The morality of Dryden appears to vary in Mr Babington's estimate with the exigencies of his argument; for he, who we are invited on p. 31 of his paper to think 'would have been too magnanimous to chastise in 1682 a man who had died four years before,' is presented on p. 34 as one who, in circumstances of peculiar meanness, stole the best work of a dead friend, of whom he had written with affectionate regret.

It is not in these terms that Mr Babington states his conclusion, but he goes so far as to admit that it is 'a rather ugly one'; it is indeed, and he does not make it less hideous by describing the thievish conduct of which he accuses Dryden by any form of words such as 'adopted as his own.' This is the euphemism which he employs, and whether it was intended to do so or not, it cannot but suggest, even to those who know little more of Dryden and Oldham than their names, a ribald travesty of the second of the beautiful lines:

> Farewell too little and too lately known,
> Whom I began to think, and call my own;

This is not the occasion for any review of the attacks that were made upon Dryden's life and work by some of his contemporaries: it is sufficient to say that his name remains, after all, one of the greatest in English literature, and when an odious charge such as this is brought against him, we have a right to require of his accuser some adequate measure of care, accuracy and knowledge.

---

[1] See *Dryden not the Author of 'Mac Flecknoe,'* by Percy L. Babington, pp. 25 ff. *ante*.

Mr Babington tells us that in a MS.[1] in the Bodleian Library, among other pieces copied out fair, in Oldham's writing, for the printer or to hand to friends, he found '*Mac Fleckno, A Satyr,*' bearing the date 'A° 1678.' This discovery of what he takes to be the author's autograph MS. is the foundation of the indictment he has preferred against Dryden. He goes on to say that he is apparently the first person who has had occasion to make 'a thorough examination' of this MS.

It is submitted that something considerably short of a thorough examination of that portion of it upon which he relies for his conclusion will demonstrate that, so far from being the author's MS., it is only a partial transcript and a bad one at that.

To begin with, Mr Babington is mistaken in stating that he found in the MS. '*Mac Fleckno, A Satyr,*' if he intended to suggest, as every one would understand him to do, that it contains the complete poem. *Mac Flecknoe* as printed consists of 217 lines, of which 115 only, written on three pieces of paper, one of them separated by a number of leaves from the other two, are all that are there.

It is, comparatively speaking, a small point, but it should be noted that the other pieces in this MS., which Oldham published as his, and which bear dates, are dated, not as this particular piece is, with the year only, but with the month as well, with, in some cases, the addition (as Mr Babington noticed, without attaching any importance to the fact) of the places where they were composed.

People who are interested in Dryden are aware that the *Mac Flecknoe* of 1682 has a number of obvious errors of the press, corrected in 1684[2], of which the following are perhaps the most striking.

(*a*) Sir Formals oratory Wit be thine: l. 168.
(For *Wit* read *will*)

(*b*) This is thy Promise, this thy wondrous way, l. 187.
(For *Promise*, read *province*,)

(*c*) He said: but his last words were scarcely heard;
For Bruce and Longvil had a trap prepared,
And down they sent the yet declining bard. ll. 211—3.
(For *declining* read *declaiming*)

---

[1] *Rawlinson*, poet. 123; 14616 in the Summary Catalogue.

[2] *Miscellany Poems....By the most Eminent Hands...London, Printed for Jacob Tonson*, 1684, where *Mack Flecknoe, Absolom and Achitophel* and *The Medal*, without in any case the author's name, occupy pp. 1—104.

All these errors occur in the Bodleian MS. which also introduces in l. 41 the reading—truly surprising, if it were in the author's hand—'And big with *him*' instead of *hymn.* Oldham may have been as unattractive a character as Mr Babington, his prospective editor, thinks him; he was not a born fool.

The year to which this piece is assigned in the MS. may or may not be correct. Oldham may have put upon it what he understood, but mistakenly, to be the date of its composition; on the other hand, there is no apparent difficulty in supposing that Dryden did in fact write it in 1678, that it was circulated in MS. and in 1682 was printed from a transcript containing errors, some of which appeared also in that copied by Oldham.

The description of him in the heading as 'the True Blew-Protestant Poet' was not, as far as is known, justified at the earlier date by anything Shadwell had then written.

If it be objected that the second of these suggestions with reference to the date of composition is not feasible, because he and Dryden were upon friendly terms at a later period, as is evidenced by Mr Babington's statement that the prologue to *The True Widow* was written in 1679, it should be remembered that the writing of prologues and epilogues was with Dryden a matter of business, and that though the precise date of it cannot now be ascertained, this particular prologue was, in all probability, produced before March 21st, 1678.

Mr Babington finds, so he says, much significance in the subject-matter of the poem; apparently, because 1678 is also the accepted date of Flecknoe's death.

If, which is open to doubt, the passage in the dedication of *The Kind Keeper* about the poet of 'scandalous memory' has any reference to him at all, it affords no ground whatever for supposing that he died in 1678, nor need anyone wonder, as Mr Babington does, whether words of Dryden in the same place suggested the form of anything alleged to have been written in that year, for the simple reason that *The Kind Keeper* appeared, not as he supposes in 1678, but in 1680[1].

One is not much impressed with the parallels: the pregnant brain, the 'vile uses' to which the writings of others may or ought to be put, Nature and Art, and even Hannibal as the implacable foe, strike one as being mere common-places, and if it be urged that stress is to be laid rather on the names of particular persons that are introduced, one can only say that most, if not all of them, are almost equally common-places of the period in like connexions: but whatever view may be taken of them, it is obvious that if *Mac Flecknoe* was available in 1678, the occurrence in it of words and phrases which it is sought to claim for Oldham by reference to his published writings, may point to a conclusion quite different from that at which Mr Babington wishes to arrive.

---

[1] The dedication was probably written in the autumn of 1679, but here, as in the case of Dryden's *Juvenal*, the date on the title-page is adopted as that of publication.

Something must be said—a great deal less than might be—about the way in which, apart from any consideration of the Bodleian MS., this charge has been presented.

Scott, one feels sure, would have disclaimed, upon all grounds, the distressing title of 'proto-editor,' which is conferred on him by Mr Babington, but the latter appears never to have heard of, or, at least, never to have consulted Malone's laborious work. If he will look at Malone's *Dryden*, he will find set out in full (I, 169) the statement from the last page of *Mac Flecknoe*, which he says has been overlooked or ignored by all editors, and (I, 170–3) a collation of the first edition, which, according to him, it does not appear that any of them has examined.

The statement that Scott thanks Malone for a transcript of the title-page of it, is simply Mr Babington's invention, and there is, beyond the fact that he says it was published not by Tonson but by D. Green, no more ground for suggesting that Scott 'seems interested in Dryden's sudden change of publisher.' There was, of course, no change of publisher: the state of the text of the *Mac Flecknoe* of 1682 is sufficient to show that the publication was unauthorized, and there is no more mystery about it than there is about the appearance of other things, *e.g.* Oldham's *A Satyr against Virtue*, transcripts of which found their way into booksellers' hands.

It is entirely misleading to suggest, as Mr Babington allows himself to do, that what he describes as *two difficulties* in connexion with the authorship of *Mac Flecknoe* have never been recognised or dealt with as such by any editor of Dryden.

With regard to the first of these, it is true that we read in Scott (*Dryden* I, 223), 'we cannot believe Shadwell's assertion,' but an impartial statement should have included the qualification of his disbelief which he expressed as follows (*op. cit.* X, 433–4), 'From this (Shadwell's) averment, which is probably made far too broadly, we can only infer that Dryden like Swift in the same predicament left his adversary to prove what he had no title to call upon him to confess; for that he seriously meant to disavow a performance of which he had from the beginning sufficiently avouched himself the author can hardly be supposed for a moment.' Mr Babington says 'All later editors have substantially endorsed Scott's views,' and, 'most other editors treat Shadwell as a liar'; statements which, by the light of the passage just quoted, seem to require modification.

The second supposed difficulty hinges on the date, Oct. 4, 1682, which it is said is 'universally accepted' as the day on which *Mac Flecknoe* appeared.

The date in question was almost certainly obtained by Malone from the title-page of the copy which was once Narcissus Luttrell's. That business-like collector was in the habit of inscribing upon his tracts the prices he paid for those he bought—he generally succeeded in getting discount—and the date upon which each came into his possession: sometimes, but most certainly not always, this was also the date of publication. It was most probably not so in the case of this poem, for in *The Loyal Protestant* of Thursday, February 9, 168½, in the course of an attack upon Shadwell, the following passage occurs—'he would send him (Shadwell) his Recantation next morning, with a *Mac Flecknoe*, and a brace of Lobsters for his Breakfast; All which he knew he had a singular aversion for.' It is, of course, conceivable, though one is inclined to think that the expression '*a* Mac Flecknoe' makes it unlikely, that the reference is only to a written copy of the poem, but the fact that it was in existence and apparently well-known early in 1682 disposes of the suggested difficulty of two attacks by Dryden upon Shadwell, with a very brief interval between them.

Mr Babington appears to be entirely unaware of

(*a*) the evidence contained in Mulgrave's *Essay upon Poetry*, 1682, which Dryden says he publicly valued before he knew who the author was[1]:

> The Laureat here may justly claim our praise,
> Crown'd by *Mac-Fleckno* with immortal Bays;
>
> *Op. cit.*, p. 10.

(*b*) the repetition of this couplet in the second edition, of 1691, with two notes to explain that the Laureat is 'Mr D—n' and *Mac-Fleckno* 'A famous Poem of his.'

(*c*) the passage in *The Laurel, A Poem On The Poet-Laureat*, 1685, pp. 21–2:

> Your too keen Satyr, does oblige your Foe,
> As harmless *Tom's* kind dulness still does you.
> Your *Fleckno's* kind, (tho' still severe enough)
> It arms him Cap-a-pe with Nonsense Proof.

---

[1] *Sylvae: Or, The Second Part of Poetical Miscellanies*...1685, a 3 *verso*: see also *A Discourse on Epick Poetry*, Malone, III, 438.

(*d*) the thrice-repeated statement of Langbaine:

> Now that Mr. *Dryden* may not think himself slighted in not having some Verses inserted in his Commendation; I will present the Reader with a Copy written by Mr. *Flecknoe*, and leave him to Judge of his Wit, and Mr. Dryden's Gratitude by comparing the Epistle Dedicatory to his *Kind Keeper*, and his Satyr call'd *Mack Flecknoe*, with the following Epigram.—*An Account of the English Dramatick Poets.* 1691, p. 176.
>
> For whatever becomes of his own Pieces, his Name will continue whilst Mr. *Dryden's* Satyr call'd *Mack Flecknoe*, shall remain in Vogue.—*Ibid.*, p. 199.
>
> Mr. *Dryden*, I dare presume, little imagined, when he writ that Satyr of *Mack-Flecknoe*, that the subject he *there* so much exposes and ridicules, should have ever lived to have succeeded him in wearing the *Bays.*—*Ibid.*, p. 443.

His ignorance of contemporary publications leaves him in a ridiculous position with regard to one part of his attack, which he has casually introduced in a foot-note (p. 26): he is aware of Sir A. Ward's statement that Dryden does not appear to have acknowledged *Mac Flecknoe* before 1692, but rashly assuming that the knowledge of Sir Adolphus upon the subject is rather less than his own, he has brought against this great master of plain English the absolutely preposterous charge of having in 1693, when he wrote 'and (if it be not too vain to mention anything of my own) the poems of *Absalom and Achitophel* and *Mac Flecknoe*,' 'expressed himself so artfully' that he could always disclaim the second poem, when the fact is he had himself published it under his own name in the previous year[1].

Mr Babington has never, it would seem, heard of the suggested identification of Flecknoe as the 'R. F.,' the writer of *A Letter to the Honourable Ed. Howard, Esq. occasioned by a Civiliz'd Epistle of Mr. Dryden's before his Second Edition of his Indian Emperour*[2] which it is thought may have provoked Dryden's ill will, and he is content to ascribe to Oldham attacks for which he makes no attempt to hint at a motive, beyond offering the amiable suggestion that one of them was due to the fact that the victim of it was at the time either seriously ill or recently dead!

The statements to which Mr Babington commits himself upon the subjects of Rochester's *Works*, their editors (save the mark!), and their contents, his idea that Giles Jacob was a contemporary of Oldham and a literary authority to be quoted with Dryden, and many other points in his paper, invite comment, but, as these are matters not directly concerned with his main purpose, it is withheld.

G. THORN-DRURY.

LONDON.

---

[1] *Miscellany Poems: In Two Parts....Published by Mr. Dryden....The Second Edition...* 1692.

[2] *Gentleman's Magazine*, Dec. 1850. *Pepys' Diary*, ed. Wheatley, VIII, 108. *Essays of Dryden*, ed. Ker, I, 306.

A VISIT TO THE FRIENDS OF IBSEN.

In the summer of 1872 I received special leave from the Principal Librarian of the British Museum to visit Denmark and Norway for the purpose of reporting on the state of current literature in those countries. Of my Danish experiences I have given an account in my book called *Two Visits to Denmark* (Smith, Elder & Co., 1911); but hitherto I have not published any of my Norwegian adventures. I am led to do so now, in consequence of a letter which I have just received from Rektor Frederik Ording, of Holmestrand, who is engaged on a biographical work on 'Henrik Ibsen's Ungdomsvenner,' and who tells me that it has become almost impossible to obtain information about the particular group of men of letters whom I conversed with more than forty-five years ago. They are all long since dead, and no one survives who recollects them in their prime. No one—so it appears—but me! The fact is a solemnising one. I feel like the Moses of the poet:

> Je vivrai donc toujours puissant et solitaire?
> Laissez-moi m'endormir du sommeil de la terre;

but before I am allowed by Norway to do that, it seems that I am called upon to disgorge my recollections. They are, I am afraid, though founded on a full journal, rather slight.

Ibsen, as is well known, was at that time, and had long been, an exile from his native country, where his plays were ill received and his character subjected to a great deal of stupid insult. But there was a small circle of his early friends who remained true to the devotion which his genius had inspired in them. When I was in Copenhagen, it was impressed upon me that these men formed the real Norway, the fine flower of Norse culture and intelligence, and it was to them that I took introductions. They were mainly jurists, archeologists and historians, whose studies into the annals of their country had given them a determination to support existing institutions. They were called 'conservatives,' and by the radical press were treated as though their ideas were desperately retrograde. But in any other country but Norway, fifty years ago, they would have been called advanced liberals. They desired to introduce broad and sweeping reforms, and they were particularly desirous to follow the example of England. If I understand their position aright, they were rather Constitutionalists than Conservatives, for their first idea always was to bring their views into line with the Constitution.

A short time before my visit, the barrier which surrounded and isolated the group of men of whom I speak had been emphasised by the development of the Venstre, the national radical party, which was urged on and supported by the Peasants' party. The debates in the Storthing in 1871 and 1872 had been very bitter, and public opinion was sharply, but unequally, divided over the burning question of the admission of ministers to the national assembly. Without going further into the obscurity of foreign politics, it is enough to say here that the group into which I was for a short time admitted as an indulged and attentive guest, had the hope that, with all its talents and knowledge, it would be called upon to take over the government of the country. It was thought that Aschehoug would oust the radical Sverdrup as the next Prime Minister. The reign of constitutionalism would begin; the peasant leaders would be sent back to their farms; and Norway would open a splendid period of conservative re-action. In this, the friends were supported by the most powerful newspaper of the country, *Morgenbladet*, which like themselves had long been frankly democratic, but had recently taken a very strong line in opposition to the Left. *Morgenbladet* was boisterously attacked by *Dagbladet*, the rival newspaper, edited by Samuel Bætzmann, a bearded and very tall young man, who was pointed out to me in the street, with execration and contempt, by Jakob Lökke.

The hope of my friends was not realised. The whole tendency of Norwegian life was in the opposite direction, and a few days after I left Christiania, the death of King Carl had the effect of still further encouraging the liberals. The group I had known were swept out of public life by the tide of radicalism, and suffered the obscuration which awaits the unsuccessful politician. Now, as it appears, when all passion has died down, there is a great curiosity about men whose talents and accomplishments, as well as their high patriotism, were an asset in the civilisation of Norway at a critical moment. Hence, when it is almost too late, and when I am left the only survivor, I am appealed to for my recollections, pale and slight as they must be.

Late, then, in the summer of 1872 I arrived in Christiania, armed with cards and letters of introduction from friends in Copenhagen, and with a recommendation from Tennyson to Professor Ludwig Kristensen Daa, who had been very civil to the poet when he visited Norway. I arrived in the midst of the excitement caused by the recent celebration of the 1000 years' festival, and in particular we crossed Prince Oskar who was returning to Stockholm from being present at Haugesund on that occasion, when he had unveiled a colossal symbolic statue of Harald Fairhair. Before my first evening closed in, I hastened to explore the length of the city right up Carl Johans Gade to the New Park; and in the Eidsvoldplads, a square opposite the Storthing House, I received a little shock, for gazing up at the new bronze statue of Harald Fairhair, I saw the drapery rise and flutter in the wind. This was not a replica of the national statue at Haugesund, but an independent design, put up in lath and plaster to see whether public opinion approved of it. It occurred to me afterwards that it was the symbol of the stalwart conservatism of the group of friends of whom I am about to speak, who trusted to their heroic attitude to impress public opinion,—and failed.

Early next morning I called on Jakob Lökke (1829–1881), who was head-master of the Christiania Cathedral School, and the leading educational authority in Norway. I had been able to be of some assistance to Lökke in London during the year 1871, and his hospitable and genial acquaintance was now very valuable to me. Close to the great church of Our Saviour, in the centre of the city, in the first house on the left-hand side of the Stor Gade, Mr and Mrs Lökke had an apartment on the third story in which they received a small, but extremely distinguished, circle of guests. Lökke was pompous in manner and a touchy man, but full of warmth and generosity under a somewhat difficult surface. His hospitality to me, on this occasion, was untiring, and it was wholly owing to him that I was admitted to the remarkable group of Norse Tories who were making so resolute and so vain a struggle to stem the rising flood of radicalism. Lökke's 'tredie étage' in Stor Gade was a typical home of lost causes, and the group of friends were all ardent supporters of Ibsen, whose satirical temper was then looked upon askance by the various popular parties.

The first person to whom Lökke presented me was Emil Stang (born 1834), the son of the then prime minister of Norway, Frederik Stang, and a leading advocate. He became very cordial when he learned that I was bent on introducing Ibsen to the English public, and had begun to do so; and he told me that he held a brief for the poet at that moment. It will be remembered that Ibsen then resided in Dresden. Taking advantage of this exile, a Danish publisher of the baser sort had produced a pirated edition of the *Warriors of Helgeland*, with an announcement that a similar reprint of *Madam Inger at Österraad* would follow. Stang laughed as he told me of Ibsen's gigantic anger at this offence; he had immediately put the matter into Stang's hands, and had desired him to get a full indemnity from the Danish publisher. But it was the usual case of trying to bleed a stone. The man would not even withdraw his edition, though no more was said of the projected piracy of *Madam Inger*. Mr Stang told me that the case was still dragging through the courts; I never learned the result.

Lökke took me to the University Library to see the Librarian, Ludwig Daae (not to be confounded with Daa), who was born in 1834 and died in 1910. The visit was untimely, for Daae had not arrived, and only one single clerk was on duty. This man was ready to be friendly, but he was being bullied by the Principal Librarian of the University of Stralsund, a typical loud-voiced Prussian, to whom I took a violent dislike. This man was acquainted with Lökke and attached himself to us; he spoke with great contempt of the Library of the British Museum, which he said he knew very well. We proceeded to the Record Office, in order to see Mr Michael Birkeland (1830–1897), the Master of the Rolls, of whom I shall have much to relate. The Record Office (Riksarkivet) was then in the same clump of buildings as the Storthing House. We did not find Birkeland in, but we found an even more illustrious person, J. E. W. Sars (1835–1915), who was already deep in the preparation of those works which have made him famous as the most philosophical of Norwegian historians. He was shortly after my visit appointed Professor of History in the University of Christiania.

My introduction to Ludwig Daae was only postponed. The next time I called at Lökke's house, a little shabby man with a beard, with woefully dishevelled hair and snuff-coloured old coat, was dancing a sort of lonely pirouette in the middle of the floor, while he talked. He stopped at my entrance, and Jakob Lökke, coming forward, presented me to him as 'the Librarian of the University, Ludwig Daae.' 'The author of that delightful *Gamle Kristiania?*' I asked. 'Ah, do you know my book?' he said, and seemed pleased. I felt very much drawn to Ludwig Daae from the first, and he spoke Norwegian so plainly and elegantly that it was particularly easy for me to follow him. All through the rest of my visit to Christiania I had the benefit of his kindliness and wit, his ingenuousness and his fund of knowledge. His book, *Gamle Kristiania*, a picturesque series of essays on the history of the city up to 1800, was familiar to me, and I had written a long review of it in the *Spectator* for Richard Holt Hutton, in which I had ventured to say that it would be impossible for any one in future to attempt a history of modern Norwegian affairs without the help of Mr Daae's admirable book.

The name of this gentleman offered much difficulty, because, by a very odd coincidence, there were at that moment three unrelated persons whose names were in sound identical. There was Ludwig K. Daa, and there were two Ludwig Daaes, my friend, and a politician whom I did not meet. Norwegians themselves found the identity of the three very confusing. My Ludwig Daae had begun his literary career with an ecclesiastic history of the diocese of Throndhjem, published in 1863, and had gradually extended his range from church to general history, but his gift really lay in the picturesquely biographical. He had just been made lector in æsthetics in the Cathedral School when I saw him, but he held this but a very short time, being soon after my visit appointed Professor of History at the University.

I had now the honour of being admitted every day to the company of Daae and his friends, and it was clearly explained to me that they formed a compact and still influential body of resistance to the subversive policy of Björnson, Sverdrup and the terrible peasant Jaabæk, whom they regarded with peculiar apprehension. Hans Christian Andersen had given me a note of introduction to Björnson, and in spite of the objections of my new friends, I found that I could not resist the temptation to use it. Accordingly I went to the house in Munkedamsveien which Björnson shared with the philosopher G. V. Lyng (1827–1884) whom I had met in Denmark. They occupied a small house in a long suburban lane on the edge of the city. I had been told that the poet was very formidable, and as I waited in the hall, I heard him growling 'Saa! saa? saa!' over the card and note I had sent in. I quaked, but I plunged; I was ushered into a pretty room with trellised windows, where a large and even burly man (Björnson was then under forty), who was sitting astride the end of a narrow sofa, rose vehemently to receive me. His long limbs, his athletic frame, and especially his remarkably forcible face, surrounded by a mane of wavy brown hair, and illuminated by full blue eyes behind flashing spectacles, gave an instant impression of physical vigour. He was truculently cordial, and lifted his ringing tones in civil conversation. Resuming his singular attitude astride the sofa, he entered affably into a loud torrent of talk, lolling back, shaking his great head, suddenly bringing himself up into a sitting posture to shout out, with a palm pressed upon either knee, some question or statement.

His full and finely modulated voice, with his clear enunciation, greatly aided his not a little terrified visitor in appreciating his remarks, but he spoke at great speed, and it strained the attention of a foreigner to follow his somewhat florid volubility. He expressed himself highly pleased with the reception his romances had received in England, but seemed surprised that his dramas were not known. He recommended to me a new viking-play, called *Sigurd Jorsalfar*, which he had just sent to press, and which had been refused 'though with the loveliest music by Grieg ever heard out of a dream' by the Royal Theatre in Copenhagen, a repulse which Björnson flatly attributed to the malignity of the manager, Molbech. He promised to send me to London a copy of *Sigurd Jorsalfar* as soon as it was published, and he was so amiable as to keep his word.

This little adventure in the head-quarters of the opposition was not at all well regarded in Stor Gade. Accordingly I was taken, as a counterbalancing influence, to be presented at his country parsonage of Vest Aker to the old poet and folk-lorist Jörgen Moe (1813–1882). Lökke and Daae were my companions on this visit to the celebrated collector, in common with Asbjörnsen, of the so universally admired Norse legends and fairy-tales. The situation of Vest Aker is magnificent; as we drove past the little church to the court of the 'præstegaard,' the whole of the head-waters of the Christiania Fjord wound and sparkled below us, golden in the blue circle of the hills. Moe, dressed in clerical black, with the white ruff round his throat, greeted us delicately. He was a charming man, with his soft voice and beautiful stag-like eyes; a perfectly gracious and venerable figure, not incapable, however, of receiving a mild excitement from the fact that his poems were presently to be introduced to the English public. Almost immediately after my visit Jörgen Moe was appointed Bishop of Christianssand. As we came back from Vest Aker, my guides showed me the grave of the biographer and bibliographer, Botten-Hansen (1824–1869), and the famous grotto of Wergeland, once in the country, but, already in 1872, touched by the outskirts of the city. As we were crossing the streets in the neighbourhood of the Uranienborg Church, a pale old face appeared for a moment at an upper window. Daae said this was the house where Johan Sebastian Welhaven (1807–1873) was being nursed, and he thought that it was Welhaven we had seen. Lökke did not think it was, so that I shall never know whether I did, or did not, catch a glimpse of the illustrious and the dying author of *Norges Dæmring*. My companions were much amused, and I think gratified, by my eager interest in all these literary associations.

I now left the capital for a little tour by myself in Ringeriget and Gudbrandsdalen, where I had an invitation to meet Asbjörnsen, with whom I had corresponded from London. He had been staying at Ringebo, at the parsonage of the Dean (*Provst*) of Gudbrandsdalen, Dr Neils Christian Hald (1808–1885). I did not, however, go thither directly, but at the advice of Daae, posted over the hills to Drammen, a magnificent drive by a very circuitous route. Daae had given me letters of introduction; he had passed his youth in that town, and was Professor of History there until he was brought to Christiania. His friends received me with generous hospitality, and among the merchant princes of Drammen I found a greater appearance of luxury than I happened to meet with in the capital. When I finally reached Ringebo, I was disappointed to find that Asbjörnsen had been obliged to leave for Romsdalen, on his duties as Torvmester or Forester-General. I was equally unlucky in an attempt to see the poet Kristoffer Jansen (1841–1899) at his school-house at Fykse-in-Gausdal, for he was spending the holidays at Tromsö, in Finmark. After a most enjoyable stay in the picturesque parsonage of the kind Halds, I returned to Christiania.

On the 7th of August I was back in Stor Gade, and was helping Lökke with the notes to a school-book in English literature which he was just publishing; afterwards we called on the Hellenist, Frederik Ludvig Vibe (1803–1881), who was Librarian of the Cathedral School, and a great ally of Lökke and Daae. I was shown his translation of Æschylus into Norse. My acquaintance with the group of Ibsen's friends was now further extended, for on the evening of the next day (August 8), Ludwig Daae asked me to supper, and, when I arrived, I found, beside the host, Michael Birkeland and Dr Oluf Rygh.

I have already mentioned Birkeland's position at the Rolls Office, which he had entered in 1852, and now commanded. He was not, I think, ambitious of literary fame, and he had at that time published, of an original kind, little except pamphlets. His best-known work was his minutely executed 'Reports of the earliest sessions of the Storthing,' but this was only a part of his multifarious research into the whole political history of the country. Birkeland was the life and soul of the *Norske historiske Forening* (Norwegian Historical Society), which then and since did so much for the science of history. He was constantly publishing for the government inedited matter from the very copious archives under his charge. Underneath the mask of the archivist he barely concealed a burning political ambition to be a part of the new constitutional life of Norway. The Master of the Rolls was one of the most attractive men

I met in Scandinavia. He was still, in early middle age, very handsome, well set-up, with a fine head excellently poised above broad shoulders, and with brilliant, dancing eyes. The fault of Norwegians in that day was their deadly seriousness, and their excessive sensitiveness to the slightest indication of criticism. But Birkeland was superior to this local weakness, and was genial, without the least pomposity. The fourth member of our party, Oluf Rygh (1833–1899), was united with Birkeland in his devotion to archeology. He also had at that time published very little, but I was told that his investigations were of the highest value, as indeed they amply proved to be. He was the bosom-friend of Birkeland, with whom he formed a singular contrast, being as reserved as the other was effusive, and a small, squat figure, with a round bald head and a bare face, horny and spectacled, which reminded my pert fancy of the shell of a crab.

Daae's house, where we met, was in the country, to the west of Christiania, on the Drammensvej, and close to the sea, with a fine view across the fjord to the royal palace of Oskarshal. There was much conversation at supper about politics, and my companions were emphatic in their conviction that the only hope for a healthy development of the Norwegian nation was a return to conservative methods. Daae spoke with deep resentment of the 'fanatical measures of the Radical party,' and with horror of the peasant leader Sören Jaabæk (born 1814), who had just become very prominent owing to his being refused Holy Communion by his parish priest, Pastor Lassen, as a protest against his republican views. My friends thought that the incumbent of Lyngdal had behaved with courage and propriety in 'fencing the table' against him. When the meal was concluded, Birkeland proposed my health, and, standing up in the Norse fashion, made a little speech. He said 'Englishmen often come to us that they may climb our mountains or fish in our lakes, but it is rare indeed for a young man of letters to visit us that he may investigate what is most dear to us, our native literature, the labour of our hearts and our heads.' He also spoke at length with regard to the 1000 years' festival, which appeared to occupy the thoughts of the whole group.

We all came away together, Daae accompanying us to the boundary of the City. At this western end, Christiania then (1872) consisted of very new and fantastic villas whose inhabitants, Daae told me, had never got over the affront which the poet Welhaven had paid them of calling their suburb Snobopolis: which name still stuck to it. It was midnight when we reached the heart of the city, and as the hour boomed forth from the Cathedral, Birkeland held me there in the great square while he discoursed on the history of the building, and on the vestiges of Catholic architecture in Norway.

On the 9th of August, I spent the morning with Lökke in his study, and then we paid a visit to L. K. Daa (1809–1877), the ethnographer and archeologist. I have said that even Norwegians were easily confused between Daae and Daa, and they escaped from the dilemma by calling the younger 'Bibliothekaren' and the elder 'Grænskeren,' the title of the newspaper he had edited. Daa, to whom I presented Tennyson's message, was extremely gracious, and he took me over to the Ethnological Museum, of which he was Director, and showed me some objects recently come to him from Lapland and Finland. Daa was a man of great eccentricity of appearance, tall and gaunt, with limbs flung wildly about, and his fine head recklessly bestrewn with disordered hair, grizzled and reddish. He was very restless and active, and talked English admirably; he admitted to me that he was a full-blown Anglomaniac. Daa was very much pleased to hear from me that Tennyson recollected their meeting when the poet visited Norway in 1858: Daa had served on that occasion as Tennyson's cicerone. He told me that there was great trouble caused by the English poet's extreme near-sightedness, which made him unable to drive himself in the little karjol which was then the only mode of conveyance in the interior of Norway.

Next day, I went with Lökke to visit the lexicographer and inventor of the 'landsmaal,' Ivar Aasen (1813–1896), who lived in one little room, containing a bed, two chairs and a few shelves of linguistic books. He has exercised an immense influence on the language and literature of his country. I found Aasen a prematurely shrivelled little man, with a parchment face, thin, shy and nervous. In conversation he was dull, until Lökke spoke about philology, when his eyes began to sparkle and his cheeks to flush. He talked, then, quite fast, but with a curious inward manner of speech; I confess I could not understand what he was saying.

In the afternoon Lökke and Birkeland took me for a long drive to Frognersæteren, a cottage high up in the mountain above Christiania, whence there is a magnificent view over the whole valley, and even to the Swedish frontier. The fjord, though seven miles away, seems at our feet, and is visible as far down as Moss. Up at the sæter we were received by Professor Torkel Aschehoug (1822–1909), who had been so kind as to wish that I should be presented to him. Aschehoug was the leading jurist of Norway, perhaps of Scandinavia, at that time. His great book on the Laws of Norway, which was appearing in slow instalments, contained in a form never before approached the history and the essence of the national constitution. He had been for a quarter of a century professor of civil law at the University of Christiania; he had taken up, and pushed much farther, the investigations of J. R. Keyser, when that eminent jurist died in 1864. But the extraordinary respect with which Aschehoug was regarded in the group of friends was founded on other qualities than were included in his scientific reputation. He had been drawn more and more definitely into practical politics; for the last four years he had been the leading member of the Storthing for Christiania. I was told that he was 'the coming man,' the heaven-born leader of the constitutional party which was about to reorganise Norway, and drive back the onset of the horde of radicals and peasants. I was told to observe Aschehoug, for I should live to see him the greatest politician in the North of Europe.

When we found him at the sæter, my companions greeted him with a mixture of warm affection and deep respect. He reminded me, in the eyes and mouth, and in his general bearing, of Mr Gladstone. Aschehoug was very polite to me, but I found him very alarming, and was glad that he mainly talked politics with Birkeland. In the evening, Birkeland, whose kindness to me was untiring, took me across to the eastern side of Christiania, to Oslo, the city which was destroyed to build the new capital. He showed me what he believed to be the sites of the mediæval palace and cathedral; and, so far as he could judge, the exact scene of the great battle between Haakon and Skule, which Ibsen paints in his *Kongsemnerne.* It was thrilling to go over the vestiges of the ancient city with so enthusiastic and so learned a guide as Birkeland. As it grew late, we supped together at a restaurant, and then Birkeland, in very high spirits, declared he would show me 'the night-side' of Christiania. However, we saw nothing very exciting or amusing.

Of the subsequent days of my visit to Christiania, whence I returned to Hull towards the end of August, I find nothing particular to relate. My last evening was spent at the Lökkes', in company with Daae, Birkeland and a very lively Mr Thoresen, who was a near relative of Ibsen and related amusing anecdotes of the poet's manners. Lökke went down to the quay with me next morning, and stood waving his hat as the 'Scotia' slipped down the fjord.

EDMUND GOSSE.

LONDON.

DE SUPERBIA CARMINUM.

Dant. *Vulg. Eloq.* II, c. 5, l. 51. *Ed. Oxon.*

Et licet hoc quod dictum est celeberrimum carmen [i.e. endecasyllabum] ut dignum est videatur omnium aliorum, si eptasyllabi aliqualem societatem assumat dummodo principatum obtineat, clarius magisque sursum superbire videtur; sed hoc ulterius elucidandum remaneat. Et dicimus eptasyllabum sequi illud quod maximum est in celebritate.

'And although this verse, the hendecasyllable, of which we are speaking, be held, and with justice, the most noble of all forms of verse, yet if it be allied in one way or another with the heptasyllable, keeping however its pre-eminence, it will be found still more glorious and loftier in its pride; but this must be left for further elucidation later on. And the heptasyllable we pronounce second to the most noble form, which is the hendecasyllable.'

This I take to be the passage in Dante's analytical writings where the language of analysis and criticism is most touched with passion, and most enthusiastic. Is there anything like it in the critical work of any poet? His praise of the hendecasyllable line is devoted to a mere form, an abstract rhythm and melody. And when he comes to speak of the harmony of hendecasyllable and heptasyllable his critical and analytical language, like the poetical tune of which he is speaking, rises and swells in pride and glory, *clarius magisque sursum superbire videtur. Superbia carminum* is his theme; *carmen* being used to denote the single line of whatever type. Without excuse or apology, he uses the name of a deadly sin for the intellectual virtue proper to verse of different forms. The hendecasyllable is the proudest form; the harmony of eleven and seven is prouder still, and his prose becomes resonant as he describes it. All in honour of an abstract idea, an empty frame of syllables.

It is a prophetic sentence, for this Italian harmony of eleven and seven is the great discovery of the Italian poets; long after Dante it was the chief poetical influence in the foreign languages that have owed most to Italy, always excepting the French: *quod ulterius elucidandum remaneat.* In Spanish and Portuguese, in Garcilaso and Camoëns, the correspondence of eleven and seven is observed as Dante has described and as the Italian *Canzone* had given examples of it.

Spenser copied it in his solemn odes, and Milton followed him, following of course the Italians themselves along with Spenser.

Here I take leave to mention a place in Milton where the editors have failed to correct a misprint, a wrong division of a line.

> But who is this, what thing of sea or land,
> That so bedeck'd, ornate and gay
> Comes this way sailing
> Like a stately ship
> Of Tarsus, bound for th' isles
> Of Javan or Gadier?

It is impossible to read aloud

> Comes this way sailing like a stately ship

except as a full heroic line. The division into two short lines is irrational. No one, in reading, can make anything of the printed pause, and we may be sure that whoever read the proofs to Milton read it in the only natural way, so that the printer's variation escaped notice.

What the Italian tune has meant for English poetry cannot be calculated or detailed, but it is well enough known to every one. *Lycidas*; the *Ode to a Nightingale*; the *Scholar Gipsy* and *Thyrsis*, these are among the first to be thought of when this form of verse is called to mind.

Dante does not say, though he certainly knows, that it is an Italian form. One of the curious things in his essay on the Art of Poetry, *de Vulgari Eloquentia*, is that while he treats the French and Provençal poets as equals of the Italians, and as authors of the noblest forms of line, he must have noticed several great differences between their practice and the Italian usage. The French and Provençal line is regularly divided after the fourth syllable: the fifth syllable is always a fresh word. Dante keeps this rule in his Provençal rhymes in the person of Arnaut Daniel, *Purg.* XXVI (though not in *Canz.* XXI, *in lingua trina*). This French cesura, as we may call it, is probably the reason why the Italian harmony of eleven and seven was left for the Italians to discover. Combinations of eleven and seven are found indeed in Provençal, but not very commonly; in many cases Dante's condition *dummodo principatum obtineat* is not observed; i.e. the long line is not the chief element in the stanza. The poet who is most like the Italians, as far as I have observed, in his use of eleven and seven, is Pons de Capduoill, and Pons de Capduoill in his long lines does not keep strictly to the French cesura. 'Si nom perdona la colp' el faillir': there are eight lines of this type in his poetry (ed. Napolski, p. 33), and some of these come in the poem which is most like Italian verse (*op. cit.* XXVII), though the likeness after all is slight and casual:

Per so nos deu d'amar leis enardir
Nuillz hom que trop plaidei
Ni trop cossir, nis cuite mantenir
Per tener avol lei
Mas tant c'am joven e joi e garnir
Guerra cort e domnei
Et ab armas autotz premiers ferir
En guerr' et en tornei
Lejals servire
Si humilmen
E non s'azire
Ne s'espaven
Si trai martire
Ni greu turmen
Que bos sufrire
Conquer sufren
Las qu'eu non pos mais soffrir la dolor
Tant ai sofert e tant ai gran temor
Que peichs m'esta c'a nuill autr' amador
S'umilitatz e merces nom socor.

In Spanish prosody (Rengifo, *Arte poetica española*, Salamanca, 1592) the hendecasyllable and heptasyllable are described as 'verso italiano y su quebrado,' the Italian verse and its fraction (or 'refret,' or 'refrain'). The heptasyllable is taken as repetition of part of the longer verse, just as in the native *redondillas* of eight syllable verse there may be 'versos quebrados' of four; which is likewise the French verse of *Avril* and all its train:

Here I'd come when weariest,
  Here I'd rest
Where the wide-winged hawk doth hover.

Taking the heptasyllable in this way we can see, or rather hear, why it was not usual along with hendecasyllables (=décasyllabes) of the French type and why the Italian type all but cried aloud for it. Where the verse is regularly divided into 4 + 6 there is not so much to be gained in using the *quebrado*. It is known in old French narrative verse, as at the close of each tirade in the epic of *Aliscans*, where it is a sort of lyric cadence:

Ma grans dolors n'ert jamais obliée
  Tant com jou ere en terre.

The effect of this is not far from that of Guiraut's refrain:

Et ades sera l'alba.

In French poetry, however, the heptasyllable goes most frequently with the Alexandrine. The *quebrado* of the French *décasyllabe* appears to be most commonly four, not six:

Gastibelza, l'homme à la carabine,
Chantait ainsi.

But where the long line, our heroic verse, is varied as in Italian and English, the refrain of six, or seven, comes in with peculiar effect, as dwelling on a part of the whole rhythmical phrase, letting it declare itself, whereby at the same time the long verse, in Dante's words, *clarius magisque sursum superbire videtur*. The long verse in French with its regular cesura does not give the same opportunity for a refrain to bring out the rhythm. The Italian hendecasyllable sprang from the French-Provençal line, but it is a different thing from its original, and its changes are so various that it often seems nearly to pass into another measure. E.g.

Batte col remo qualunque s'adagia. *Inf.* III, 111.
D'una fessura che lagrime goccia. *Inf.* XIV, 113.
Come la fronda che flette la cima. *Par.* XXVI, 85.

Separately, these verses might be passed off as belonging to the type

Sempre nell'animo
Mi sta quel giorno
Che con un nuvolo
D'amici intorno, etc.

which type is closely related to the regular hendecasyllable, as e.g. in another poem of Giusti, *Il Brindisi di Girella*:

Viva le maschere
D'ogni paese,
Viva il gergo d'allora e chi l'intese.

The refrain, Dante's heptasyllable, comes in effectively to keep the measure in mind where the poets allow themselves such freedom as Dante takes in the long verse. Where the long verse definitely marks the rhythm with an invariable cesura the refrain is not so clearly required. The languages have their own metrical instincts, and Dante shows this in his tract on Poetry. He will not, for example, allow the *neasyllabum*, as he calls it, which corresponds to our octosyllabic verse. But he knew well that this was one of the most favourite of all the measures of Provence. He quotes

Si per mon Sobretotz no fos.

And of course he knew the use of the measure in the Ambrosian hymns; there are his own quotations:

Vexilla regis prodeunt

and

Te lucis ante terminum.

But he will not be bribed even by these into approval of a form which after the early days has been consistently rejected by Italian poetry. French and Provençal may do as they please with the fatal fluency of octosyllabic verse; and in these languages, and in English, that verse can be as weighty as any heroic line. But there is no use for it in Italian. Dante's remark about it is not caprice; it is an Italian instinct of language.

W. P. KER.

LONDON.

MALLET'S 'HISTOIRE DE DANNEMARC' AS A SOURCE OF 'HAN D'ISLANDE.'

M. GUSTAVE CHARLIER, dealing with the sources of Victor Hugo's *Le Dernier Jour d'un Condamné*[1], says, 'Il n'est pas sans intérêt de constater qu'à vingt-sept ans le poète usait en maître de la méthode qu'il appliquera plus tard à l'élaboration d'œuvres autrement glorieuses.' Interesting results may also be obtained from an investigation of a still earlier work. How did Victor Hugo write *Han d'Islande*? Did the boy of twenty work in the same way as the mature author? What are the sources of the vast amount of information of various kinds which this semi-historical novel contains[2]?

Victor Hugo began to write *Han d'Islande* in May 1821[3], at the age of 19. Very little was actually finished in that year, the bulk of the work being continued soon after his marriage in October 1822, while the four volumes of the first edition finally appeared in the early part of February 1823. The finished work therefore dates from the author's twenty-first year, but, according to the letter he wrote to Adèle Foucher on this subject[4], the whole book was ready in his mind when he first set pen to paper:—'Lorsque j'écrivis la première ligne, je savais déjà la dernière.' The research and accumulation of material was already finished:—'Je passai beaucoup de temps à amasser pour ce roman des matériaux historiques et géographiques et plus de temps encore à en murir la conception, à en disposer les masses, à en combiner les détails.' Just as he does seven years later, Victor Hugo borrows considerably from books and periodicals published while he was actually writing his own work[5], but on this occasion he could not, as in the case of *Le Dernier Jour d'un Condamné*, acquire his historical setting and local colour personally, and therefore he applied himself to the accumulation of these details from various earlier works on the subject.

---

[1] *Comment fut écrit le Dernier Jour d'un Condamné* in the *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France*, July—December 1915.

[2] Questions of this kind can rarely be fully answered unless the author himself has left some information on the subject, but often a study of the manuscript furnishes clues of the utmost importance. In the case of *Han d'Islande* these are denied, since the manuscript has never been found.

[3] *Lettres à la Fiancée*, Lettre de samedi (le 16 février 1822).

[4] *Op. cit.*

[5] Especially this is true of the Epigraphs which head the chapters of *Han d'Islande*.

It is not proposed to investigate fully what led the author of *Bug-Jargal* to choose Norwegian history as the setting of the novel which, he said, was merely paper 'où je voudrais disposer les agitations de mon cœur neuf et brûlant, l'amertume de mes regrets, l'incertitude de mes espérances[1].' Did the following passage from Madame de Staël's *De l'Allemagne* turn his attention to the North? We know he was reading the book at this period for he quotes her version of *Faust*[2] and of *Egmont*[3]. Translations and imitations of Russian[4] and Scandinavian[5] stories appeared in the *Annales de la Littérature et des Arts* of 1821 and may have helped to interest Victor Hugo in Northern literature, for he borrowed largely from the 1822 numbers of this same publication[6]. It is also possible that he may have been influenced by Pixérécourt's *Les Forges de Norvège*, 1811, the setting of which is Konsberg and the neighbouring country. M. Berret, in *Le Moyen Age dans la Légende des Siècles et les sources de Victor Hugo*, 1911, gives the following explanation of the inspiration of *Han d'Islande*: 'En cette année 1823 et sous l'influence de Fauriel...le goût des jeunes gens s'est orienté du côté de l'exotisme; ...dans l'entourage direct de Hugo, les Deschamps, Ulric Guttinguer, Jules Lefèvre et Nodier, s'entraînent par des lectures réciproques à la connaissance des auteurs étrangers. Jules Lefèvre faisait ses débuts dans la carrière poétique l'année même de *Han d'Islande*, en publiant un poème ossianique intitulé *Le Parricide*. C'est sous l'influence de ce goût commun pour l'exotisme qu'en 1821 *Le Conservateur littéraire* publiait les *Dieux du Nord* de Barjaud et que Victor Hugo choisissait la Norvège pour cadre de ses fantaisies romanesques et des effusions lyriques de son amour pour Adèle Foucher' (page 320). But this taste for foreign literature only explains why, in 1821, Victor Hugo looked beyond France for his inspiration; it does not explain the sudden vogue of Northern literature[7] in particular. The *Conservateur littéraire*

---

[1] *Lettres à la Fiancée*, *op. cit.*

[2] *Han d'Islande*, chapter 16.

[3] *Han d'Islande*, chapter 28.

[4] *Le Bois de Marie*, nouvelle russe traduite de Joukofsky.

[5] *La Harpe du Scalde, ou Le Réveil de l'Honneur* 'imité du Scandinave par Ch. de St-Maurice.'

There are other translations from the Russian in this periodical but Victor Hugo has not made use of them.

[6] This is proved by a study of the Epigraphs in *Han d'Islande*.

[7] Compare, besides the French works of Northern inspiration already mentioned,
Pixérécourt, *Les Mines de Pologne*, 1803; *La Fille de l'Exilé*, 1819 (Russia).
Ducange, *La Suédoise*, 1821.
Balzac, *Séraphita*, 1835 (Norway).
Minerve française, 1820, } *Chants scandinaves.*
Mercure de France, 1813, }
Baour-Lormian, *Hulda*, 1822 (in *Légendes, Ballades et Fabliaux*).

(1819–21), to which he contributed so largely, was keenly interested in Ossianic literature[1]. Perhaps Victor Hugo, sharing the common love of his time for Northern literature and noticing that Iceland, Sweden and Russia had all received their share of attention from contemporary writers, decided to be at once original and in the fashion by choosing the apparently almost untouched subject of Norway. The whole subject of the interest taken in Northern literature at this time and of its influence on French literature is however too large to be treated here and we shall therefore not discuss further how Victor Hugo came to write *Han d'Islande* but endeavour to show to what sources of information he went, once he had decided that his subject should be Danish and Norwegian history of the seventeenth century.

The main historical source used by Victor Hugo is Mallet's *Histoire de Dannemarc*[2]; whether he deliberately set out to look for such a work on Danish and Norwegian History and Mythology, or whether, as has been suggested, Marchangy's *Gaule Poétique* showed him where to find the material he needed, cannot be determined, as we can trace no direct influence of Marchangy in *Han d'Islande.*

Maigron[3] suggests that the main historical figure of Victor Hugo's novel may have been partly inspired by the prisoner MacEagh in the *Legend of Montrose.* It would seem however that MacEagh, who killed Ardenvohr's four children, who was 'an outlaw and robber by profession, something also of a homicide or murderer[4],' is a very different type of captive from Schumacker, a political prisoner, ex-chancellor of the kingdom, who has fallen from power for political and personal reasons. Their prison life is certainly different; MacEagh is kept in a damp dungeon and fed on bread and water; Schumacker's prison at Munckholm has a garden where he may walk with his daughter[5]. MacEagh later helps Montrose and dies of wounds; Schumacker is released and dies a free man in 1699—'La liberté et le bonheur avaient trop ébranlé son âme; elle alla jouir d'un autre bonheur et d'une autre liberté[6].'

The whole story of Schumacker—the fictitious miners' revolt excepted—rather comes straight from the ninth volume of Mallet's

---

[1] E.g. *Le duel du précipice*, poème erse, February 1820 (utilised by Victor Hugo for the fight between Ordener and Han and especially for the latter's rescue by the bear Friend).
Les Derniers Bardes, poème ossianique, March 1820, etc. etc.

[2] P. H. Mallet, *Histoire de Dannemarc*, 3ième édition augmentée, 9 volumes 1787–8. Victor Hugo almost certainly used this edition and not the early one suggested by M. Berret, since the spelling of the earlier edition does not always agree with that of Victor Hugo: e.g. the first edition, vol. I, page 53, has Sigge, fils de Fridulph, the third (and Victor Hugo following it) writes Frigge.

[3] Maigron, *Le roman historique à l'époque romantique*, 1898.

[4] *Legend of Montrose*, chapter 16.

[5] *Han d'Islande*, chapter 9.

[6] *Han d'Islande*, conclusion.

History. It would take too much space to quote the whole of Mallet's account of Schumacker's career but the following parallel passages in the History and the novel serve to show how closely Victor Hugo followed his authority in this case. The ex-chancellor's rise to power and his period of prosperity are of course only alluded to in *Han d'Islande,* but practically every detail corresponds to the historical version.

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
'Schumacker, né dans un rang obscur, avait été comblé des faveurs de son maître.' Chapter 2.	'...le célèbre Pierre Schumacker, depuis comte de Griffenfeld ...... sa naissance n'avoit rien de distingué....A son retour le roi le prit à son service....Les faveurs, les emplois honorables et lucratifs furent déjà sous Frédéric III la récompense de ses services.' Vol. IX, Book 13, pages 110–11.

One of Schumacker's many reforms was the re-establishment of a titled nobility.

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
(Ethel is talking to her father.) 'Je ne veux point dire, seigneur, qu'il (Ordener) soit noble de la noblesse qui se donne.' 'Est-ce donc que vous savez qu'il descend d'un *jarl* ou d'un *hersa*?' And in the footnote: 'Les anciens seigneurs en Norvège, avant que Griffenfeld fondât une noblesse régulière, portaient les titres de *hersa* (baron), ou *jarl* (comte). C'est de ce dernier mot qu'est formé le mot anglais *earl* (comte).' Chapter 24.	'Une nouveauté d'un autre genre, et qui fut due également aux conseils et à la politique de Schumacker, ce fut l'établissement d'une noblesse titrée dans les deux royaumes, à l'imitation des autres états. L'ancienne histoire de Dannemarc fait mention à la vérité de la dignité de jarl, mot qu'on rend par celui de comte, et de celle de hersa, qu'on traduit par le mot de baron; mais ces titres, s'ils ont jamais été héréditaires, étoient tombés en désuétude.' Vol. IX, Book 13, pages 154–5.

The next king, Christian V, and other rulers showered honours upon Schumacker.

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
'"Autrefois," répondit Schumacker, "...on m'appelait comte de Griffenfeld et de Tonsberg, prince de Wollin, prince du Saint-Empire, chevalier de l'ordre royal de l'Eléphant, chevalier de l'ordre royal de Danebrog, chevalier de la Toison d'Or d'Allemagne et de la Jarretière d'Angleterre, premier ministre, inspecteur général des universités, grand chancelier de Danemark."' Chapter 43.	'L'électeur de Brandebourg...après la conquête de l'isle de Wollin ... la lui donna en fief avec l'espérance de la faire ériger en principauté.' Page 194. 'L'Empereur Léopold l'éleva au rang de comte d'Empire.'. Page 177. 'Vers la fin de l'année 1673 Schumacker reçut des marques de faveur si distingués, que toute la nation en fut étonnée...le roi...le revêtit d'abord des marques de l'ordre de l'éléphant, ensuite de l'éminente dignité de grand-chancelier, et lui

'N'oubliez pas qu'Ethel Schumacker n'est plus princesse de Wollin et comtesse de Tonsberg.' Chapter 40.	donna enfin la terre de Tonsberg en Norvège qu'il érigeoit en comté pour lui et sa posterité masculine et féminine.' Pages 174–5.
	'Griffenfeld engagea...le roi à le (l'ordre de Dannebrog) renouveller.........Il fut conféré à 19 personnes, au nombre desquels...Griffenfeld.' Pages 158–9.
	'Les principales charges contre lui...qu'il avoit aspiré à se faire donné une pairie en Angleterre.' Page 122.
	'Christiern V nomma Griffenfeld...inspecteur de l'université.' Page 176.
'Le roi...s'est écrié avec impatience, "Griffenfeld à lui seul en savait plus qu'eux tous."' Chapter 7.	'Il lui (au roi) échappa de dire un jour à ses ministres, "Griffenfeld tout seul connoissoit mieux les vrais intérêts de mes états que tous mes conseillers actuels ensemble."' Page 209.
'"Qu'il se marie jeune," continua Schumacker avec un sourire amer; "au moment de la disgrace on ne lui reprochera pas du moins d'avoir ambitionné le chapeau de cardinal." Le vieux favori faisait à ses propres malheurs une allusion que le lieutenant ne comprit pas.' Chapter 9.	'Louis XIV donna ordre au chevalier Terlon qui étoit alors à Rome d'écrire à Griffenfeld pour lui offrir de solliciter le pape de lui accorder un chapeau de cardinal, et Griffenfeld fut accusé d'avoir écouté cet ordre si contraire à ses devoirs et dont un homme aussi pénétrant eût vu facilement le danger si sa vanité ne l'eût ébloui.' Page 178.

Schumacker, according to Victor Hugo, thinks he ought to have married the princess offered him by the Queen.

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
'Fauste-Prudens Dertrombidès...avait préparé un épithalame pour le mariage projeté entre Schumacker, alors comte de Griffenfeld, et la princesse Louise-Charlotte de Holstein-Augustenbourg, mariage qui n'eut pas lieu.' Chapter 7.	'Elle (la reine) projeta de le marier avec la princesse Louise Charlotte, fille du duc de Holstein-Augustenbourg...... D'autres, avec plus de vraisemblance, pensèrent que c'étoit le grand-chancelier lui-même qui avoit refusé la princesse de Holstein.' Page 176.
'"Ethel," reprit sévèrement le vieillard, "ne vous jouez pas de toute votre vie. J'ai refusé la main d'une princesse de sang royal—d'une princesse de Holstein-Augustenbourg, entendez-vous cela."' Chapter 40.	
'Ceux qui ont dégradé votre père...ne pourront empêcher que vous ne soyez fille de Charlotte, princesse de Tarente.' Chapter 24.	'Schumacker aspiroit à épouser la princesse de Tarente, Charlotte Amélie de la Trimouille.' Page 176.

Both Mallet and Victor Hugo give some account of Schumacker's downfall and trial. The following are characteristic extracts from both.

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
'Le comte d'Ahlefeld, son mortel ennemi, était son successeur comme grand-chancelier.' Chapter 2.	'Sa place de grand-chancelier fut donné à son plus grand ennemi le comte d'Ahlefeld.' Page 204.
(Schumacker is speaking of Levin de Knud.) 'Savez-vous que ce fut lui qui détermina le vice-chancelier Wind, ainsi que Scheel, Vinding et le justicier Lasson, trois de mes juges, à ne point opiner pour la peine de mort?' Chapter 24.	'Wind, vice-chancelier, Scheel, conseiller privé, Vinding, conseiller d'état, Pierre Lasson, justicier, opinèrent que selon les lois, il ne méritoit pas de perdre la vie.' Page 209.

Onegix' account of the 5th of June 1676, when Schumacker's life was only saved by a royal reprieve sent as the axe was about to fall, follows Mallet extraordinarily closely.

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
'Le 5 juin...le condamné sort de sa prison, traverse la place, monte à l'échafaud d'un pas ferme et d'un air tranquille. Je veux lui lier les cheveux: il me repousse, et se rend à lui-même ce dernier service. Il y avait longtemps, dit-il en souriant au prieur de Saint-André, que je ne m'étais coiffé moi-même. Je lui offre le bandeau noir, il l'éloigne avec dédain, mais sans me marquer de mépris. "Mon ami, me dit-il, voilà peut-être la première fois qu'un espace de quelques pieds rassemble les deux officiers extrêmes de l'ordre judiciaire, le chancelier et le bourreau." Ces paroles sont restées gravées dans ma tête. Il refuse encore le coussin noir que je voulais mettre sous ses genoux, embrasse le prêtre, il s'agenouille, après avoir dit d'une voix forte qu'il mourait innocent. Alors je brisai d'un coup de masse l'écusson de ses armoiries, en criant, comme de coutume: "Cela ne se fait pas sans une juste cause!" Cet affront ébraula la fermeté du comte; il pâlit; mais il se hâta de dire: "Le roi me les a données, le roi peut me les ôter." Il appuya sa tête sur le billot, les yeux tournés vers l'est, et moi, je levai mon sabre des deux mains—Ecoutez bien! En ce moment un cri arrive jusqu'à moi;—"Grâce, au nom du roi! Grâce pour Schumacker." Je me retourne. C'était un aide de camp qui galopait vers l'échafaud en agitant un parchemin. Le comte se relève d'un air non joyeux mais satisfait. Le parchemin lui est remis. "Juste Dieu!" s'écrie-t-il, "la prison perpétuelle! Leur grâce est plus dure que la mort."' Chapter 12.	'Le 5 juin 1676 il se rendit avec une contenance tranquille et assurée sur la place de la citadelle où l'échafaud était dressé. Il lia lui-même ses cheveux, il jeta avec dédain le bandeau noir dont on vouloit lui couvrir les yeux; et après avoir protesté en peu de mots qu'il mouroit innocent, il se mit à genoux pour recevoir le coup mortel. L'éxécuteur ayant alors brisé ses armoiries en prononçant selon usage "que cela ne se faisoit pas sans juste cause," il parut plus sensible à cet affront qu'à la mort même, et changea de couleur. Cependant il se contenta de dire: "Le roi me les a données, il peut me les ôter." Au moment où l'éxécuteur levoit le sabre, un aide de camp du roi s'écria "Grâce de la part de Sa Majesté pour Schumacker" et lui remit un papier qui en contenoit les conditions. Griffenfeld qui s'étoit relevé avec un air satisfait n'eut plutôt vu qu'il étoit condamné à une prison perpétuelle qu'il retomba dans le plus grand abattement et s'écria douloureusement que cette grâce étoit plus dure que la mort même.' Page 209.

The main details added by Victor Hugo to the historical account are of two kinds—firstly, comments such as would naturally be made by an executioner who is telling the story of the day which he hoped would bring him honour and glory in his profession but which led instead to bitter disappointment and a provincial post. 'J'étais, en 1676, valet de Rhum Stald, bourreau royal de Copenhague. Lors de la condamnation du comte de Griffenfeld, mon maître étant tombé malade, je fus, grâce à mes protections, choisi pour le remplacer dans cette honorable éxécution. Le 5 juin—je n'oublierai jamais ce jour—dès cinq heures du matin, aidé du maître des basses œuvres[1] je dressai sur la place de la citadelle un grand échafaud que nous tendîmes de noir par respect pour le rang du condamné. A huit heures la garde-noble entoura l'échafaud et les hulans de Slesvig continrent la foule qui se pressait sur la place. Quel autre à ma place n'eût été enivré ! Debout, et le sabre en main, j'attendais sur l'estrade. Tous les regards étaient fixés sur moi ; j'étais en ce moment le personnage le plus important des deux royaumes. Ma fortune, disais-je, est faite, car que pourraient sans moi tous ces grands seigneurs qui ont juré la perte du chancelier ? Je me voyais déjà éxécuteur royal en titre de la capitale ; j'avais des valets, des privilèges'...etc.

Chapter 12.

The other details added by Victor Hugo arise either out of the ex-chancellor's position and character: 'Il y avait longtemps...que je ne m'étais coiffé moi-même'...'Mon ami, me dit-il, voilà peut-être la première fois qu'un espace de quelques pieds rassemble les deux officiers extrêmes[2] de l'ordre judiciaire[3], le chancelier et le bourreau': or perhaps out of the *religiosité* of the early nineteenth century ; 'dit-il en souriant au prieur de Saint-André'...'il...embrasse le prêtre'...'les yeux tournés vers l'est.'

Onegix also states that Schumacker's enemies had arranged for the reprieve to be brought—(immediately after the axe had fallen)—'afin de se donner un air de clémence.' This incident is not found in Mallet's account of Schumacker. It would therefore seem to be the invention of Victor Hugo's brain—his aim being surely to lay stress on the hatred of the count's enemies, the better to prepare the reader for the plot they lay against him by causing the miners to revolt in his name.

---

[1] Cf. Diderot et d'Alembert, *Encyclopédie*, Article *Exécuteur de la Haute Justice*, 'maître des basses-œuvres que l'on chargeoit des réparations.'

Victor Hugo has borrowed largely from this article.

[2] Compare perhaps Joseph de Maistre, *Les Soirées de Saint-Pétersbourg*, vol. II, Septième Entretien, 'Le militaire et le bourreau occupent en effet les deux extrémités de l'échelle sociale.'

Victor Hugo quotes this work, *Han d'Islande*, chapter 41.

[3] Compare perhaps Diderot et d'Alembert, *Encyclopédie*, Article *Exécuteur de la Haute Justice*, 'Aristote livre VI de ses Politiques, chapitre dernier, le (le bourreau) met au nombre des magistrats.'

The last paragraph of *Han d'Islande* concerning Schumacker's death and burial is also almost entirely historically true and taken from Mallet.

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
'Schumacker ne jouit pas longtemps de l'union d'Ethel et d'Ordener ; la liberté et le bonheur avaient trop ébranlé son âme ; elle alla jouir d'un autre bonheur et d'une autre liberté. Il mourut dans la même année 1699....... On l'inhuma dans l'église de Veer, terre que son gendre possédait dans le Jutland, et le tombeau lui conserva tous les titres que la captivité lui avait enlevés.' Conclusion.	'On le transféra dans le château de Munckholm près de Drontheim en Norvège, où il jouit d'une plus grande liberté.... Il mourut cette année là (1699) le 11 mars peu de temps avant le roi qui...venoit de lui rendre depuis quelques semaines une liberté qui ne pouvoit plus guères avoir de prix pour lui. Son corps fut transféré dans l'église de Veer, terre appartenant à son gendre en Jutlande, et on lui érigea un tombeau dont l'inscription lui conserve tous ses titres. Le roi rendit à sa fille, le seul enfant qu'il eût laissé, une partie de ses biens.' Vol. IX, Book 13, page 212.

Various other Danish characters of the period also furnish Victor Hugo with material for the historical setting he gives Schumacker and his daughter.

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
'Le seul de ses ennemis qui ne lui dût pas son élévation était le comte Ulric-Frédéric Guldenlew, fils naturel du roi Frédéric III, vice-roi de Norvège ; c'était le plus généreux de tous.' Chapter 2.	'Contre lui...les comtes Guldenlew, d'Ahlefeld, de Knuth, et le duc de Ploen.' Vol. IX, Book 13, page 204. And also : 'Frédéric eut aussi un fils naturel Ulric Frédéric Guldenlew[1] nommé avec éloge pour...les services qu'il rendoit à sa patrie pendant sa viceroyauté de Norvège.' Pages 147–8.

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
For Levin de Knud compare the whole of Chapter 24 and especially this passage where Schumacker talks to him, not recognising him. 'C'étoit un certain Levin de Knud, du Mecklembourg...il...était... un homme tel qu'il y en a bien peu.' Levin replies : 'Je ne pense pas de même. Ce Levin n'avait rien de plus que les autres hommes. Il y en a beaucoup même qui valent mieux que lui.' Chapter 24.	And also : '...des hommes propres à être employés dans les affaires. Tel étoit en particulier Levin de Knud, gentilhomme de Mecklembourg...modestie bien rare dans un favori.' Vol. IX, Book 13, page 150.

---

[1] Cf. *Han d'Islande*, Préface de janvier 1823, 'temoin le nom historique Guldenlew, que plusieurs chroniqueurs écrivent Guldenloëwe.' Another of Victor Hugo's main sources

Ordener Guldenlew, son of Ulric Frédéric Guldenlew, Viceroy of Norway, is almost entirely a fictitious personage, a romantic and chivalrous character by means of whom Adèle Foucher's fiancé could give vent[1] to the emotions which were hot within him. 'Je cherchais à disposer quelque part les agitations de mon cœur neuf et brûlant, l'amertume de mes regrets, l'incertitude de mes espérances...je voulais placer près de cette jeune fille (Ethel) un jeune homme, non tel que je suis, mais tel que je voudrais être[2].' In some details, however, Ordener's family history agrees with Mallet's account of Christian Guldenlew, illegitimate son of Christian V. 'Chrétien (V) eut aussi plusieurs enfans naturels....Dans ce nombre on distingue Christian surnommé Guldenlew qui naquit en 1671, fit ses premières armes en Hollande et en France[3], se distingue dans la défense de la Norvège, durant la guerre contre les Suédois, en fut fait le vice-roi en 1700 et mourut en 1703. C'est de lui que descendent les comtes de Danneskiold.'

Vol. IX, page 302.

The dates in this account are suitable for Victor Hugo's purpose, and from Ordener, as from Christian, descend the counts of Danneskiold. None of the other facts given about the hero of *Han d'Islande* seem to be borrowed from any historical personage. Perhaps, with his usual love of contrast, Victor Hugo created Ordener so that Schumacker might be released from captivity by the hand of the son of his old enemy. He does not, however, appear to realise that Guldenlew is not a family name but the title given to the illegitimate sons of the Kings of Denmark[4].

for *Han d'Islande* writes Güldenloewe, cf. Fabricius, *Voyage en Norvège*, 'c'est entre la principale forteresse et le château de Güldenloewe,' page 63, and page 62, 'excepté les deux collines Güldenloewe et Oldenburg.'

Gylendöve is the form used by Roger et Reverdil in *Lettres sur le Dannemarc*, 1758–64, and the *Recueil des Traits mémorables* writes Gyldenlöve.

[1] The pages where Ordener expresses his love for Ethel and his sorrow at their separation are strongly reminiscent both of *Guy Mannering* (translated 1816) and *Les mystères d'Adolphe* translated in 1808 from Anne Radcliffe. Cf. also *Les Proscrits*, 1802, by Charles Nodier.

[2] *Lettres à la Fiancée, op. cit.*

[3] This is perhaps hardly to be compared with *Han d'Islande*, chapter 10: 'Oh non, il ne connaît seulement pas la Clélie. Non, ce n'est pas le fils du vice-roi.'

[4] Cf. (*a*) Miège, *Etat présent de Dannemarc*, traduit de l'Anglais, 1694, pp. 148–9: 'Le Roi...a eu deux fils naturels..... l'un......se nomme le jeune Guldenlew, pour le distinguer de l'aîné qui est Viceroy de Norvègue....Ce nom de Guldenlew est approprié aux Fils naturels des Rois.'

(*b*) Molesworth, *Mémoires*, 1705, p. 258: 'Ce nom de Guldenleeuw est aproprié aux fils naturels des Rois.'

Did Victor Hugo read these works and ignore this fact? It cannot at present be proved that he knew them, although a comparison of the following passages amongst others suggests that he did.

Han d'Islande.	*Etat présent de Dannemarc*, p. 151.
Compare the character of the lieutenant d'Ahlefeld, chapters 3 and 10 and especially	'Depuis que les Danois ont une si bonne correspondance avec la France...ils affectent

Historical events of this and earlier reigns are introduced into the fabric of the novel, chiefly in connection with Griffenfeld.

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
(*a*) 'Le roi, apprenant il y a un mois que les négociations avec le duc de Holstein Plon ne marchaient pas, s'est écrié avec impatience:—"Griffenfeld à lui seul en savait plus qu'eux tous."' Chapter 7.	'Ces deux princes...s'opposoient à ce que cette ville (Holstein-Plon) fut reconnue pour indépendante et impériale.' Vol. IX, Book 13, page 131. And also: 'Frédéric III ne vit pas la conclusion de ce long procès.' Page 132.

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
(*b*) [Schumacker is speaking at his trial.] 'Je ne serai point fâché en effet de voir...s'il vous suffira d'une virgule pour causer ma mort, comme il vous a suffi d'une lettre de l'alphabet pour provoquer la guerre avec la Suède!' And in the note: 'Il y avait eu en effet de très graves différends entre le Danemark et la Suède, parce que le comte d'Ahlefeld avait exigé, dans une négociation, qu'un traité entre les deux états donnât au roi de Danemark le titre de *rex Gothorum*, ce qui semblait attribuer au monarque danois la souveraineté de la Gothie, province suédoise; tandis que les suédois ne voulaient lui accorder que la qualité de *rex Gotorum*, dénomination vague qui équivalait à l'ancien titre de souverains danois, *roi des Gots*. C'est à cette *h*, cause, non d'une guerre, mais de longues et menaçantes négociations, que Schumacker faisait sans doute allusion.' Chapter 43.	'Les ministres de Suède...objectèrent que le roi de Dannemarc prenoit dans leurs pleins pouvoirs le titre de roi des Goths, Rex Gothorum, et que ce mot ne devoit point être écrit avec un *h*, parce qu'alors il désignoit la province de Gothie qui appartenoit à la Suède, au lieu qu'étant écrit simplement Gotorum sans la lettre *h*, il signifie la Jutlande qui est au roi de Dannemarc.' Vol. IX, Book 13, pages 229–30.
(*c*) A quotation from the 'Book of the Knights of Danebrog' is read at Schumacker's second trial. 'Christiern, par la grâce et miséricorde du Tout-Puissant, roi de Danemark et de Norvège, des Vandales et des Goths, duc	The heading of a royal decree in the reign of Frederick III of Denmark is given as follows: 'Frédéric III, par la grâce de Dieu, roi de Dannemarc et de Norvège, des Vandales et des Goths, duc de Sleswick,

---

'Dites-moi—les nœuds de ruban rose au bas du justaucorps sont-ils toujours de mode? A-t-on traduit quelques nouveaux romans de cette française, la demoiselle Scudéry? Je tiens précisément la Clélie. C'est mon code de galanterie...Avant-hier, étant de garde, je mis exprès pour elle (Ethel) une superbe fraise, qui m'était envoyée de Paris même.' Chapter 3.	les modes de France d'avoir des domestiques français aussi bien que des officiers dont ils ont un Lieutenant Général....' Molesworth, page 179. 'Les gentilshommes et les officiers sont fort propres en habits faits à la mode de France.'

de Slesvig, de Holstein, de Stormarie et de Dytmarse, comte d'Oldenbourg et de Delmenhurst[1], savoir faisons qu'ayant rétabli, sur la proposition de notre grand-chancelier comte de Griffenfeld...l'ordre royal de Danebrog, fondé par notre illustre aïeul saint Waldemar, sur ce que nous avons considéré que cet ordre vénérable ayant été créé en souvenir de l'étendard Danebrog, envoyé du ciel à notre royaume béni.' Chapter 48.	de Holstein, de Stormarie et de Dytmarse comte d'Oldenbourg et de Delmenhorst. Vol. ix, Book 12, page 85. 'On prétend que le roi Valdemar II avoit déjà créé des chevaliers de Dannebrog, sur le champ de bataille où...ses troupes avoient été ralliés par l'étendart dit Dannebrog qui leur fut envoyé du ciel ...mais depuis que cet étendart avoit été perdu...on avoit cessé de conférer l'ordre...; Griffenfeld engagea le roi à le renouveller.' Vol. ix, Book 13, pages 158–9.
(*d*) 'Les belles dames de Charlottenbourg.' Chapter 26.	'Un palais auquel le séjour qu'y fit ensuite la reine Charlotte Amélie fit donner le nom de Charlottenbourg.' Vol. ix, Book 13, page 161.
(*e*) 'On dresse la potence à midi'... 'Une grande potence était en effet appuyée au mur'...'Un écu pour avoir remis un bras de bois neuf à la potence de pierre du bourg.' Chapter 12.	'Christiern II fit dresser des gibets dans les villes de province qu'il traversa.' Vol. v, Book 6, page 455.

Even Han, the brigand and outlaw, knows the history of his country and uses his knowledge when it suits him to do so.

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
'L'évêque lui dit: "Mon fils, dans quelle intention avez-vous donc commis tant de crimes?" Le brigand se mit à rire. '"Ma foi, je te jure, révérend évêque, que ce n'était pas, comme ton confrère l'évêque de Borglum, dans l'intention de m'enrichir."' And in the note: 'Quelques chroniqueurs affirment qu'en 1525 un évêque de Borglum se rendit fameux par divers brigandages. Il soudoyait des pirates, disent-ils, qui infestaient les côtes de Norvège. Ce fait est néanmoins fort douteux.' Chapter 45.	'Christophe II...osa faire arrêter un évêque de Borglum de Jutlande, qu'il accusoit de divers crimes.' Vol. iv, Book 4, page 148. 'Un auteur contemporain (1522)... assure qu'avant cette ordonnance il (l'évêque de Borglum) envoyoit souvent sur le rivage jusqu'à trois cents hommes qui n'épargnoient pas les menaces les plus terribles pour obliger les équipages des vaisseaux que la tempête y jetoit, à souffrir sans résistance qu'on pillât leurs biens à leurs yeux.' Vol. v, Book 6, page 520.

The early history of Denmark, as seen in Mallet, serves Victor Hugo in various ways. The greater part of it is used as matter for Spiagudry's learned dissertations.

---

[1] Cf. *Lettres sur le Dannemarc*, *op. cit.*, page 153: 'Les Rois de Dannemarc,' and in a note, 'Les étrangers ne seront pas fâchés de trouver ici les titres en entier, "Christian V du nom, Roi de Dannemarc et de Norvege, des Goths et des Vandales, duc de Slesvig, de Holstein, de Stormarie et des Ditmarses, Comte d'Oldenbourg et de Delmenhorst."' This work often quotes Mallet and reciprocally Mallet quotes it in Vol. ix, Book 12, so that Victor Hugo probably knew it but found the same information in the fuller work of Mallet.

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
'"C'est sans doute quelque charlatan," dit Spiagudry, "*ambbisbaïarum collegia, pharmacopolae*, quelque misérable qui convertit l'or en plomb et les plaies en ulcères....Encore si ces imposteurs se bornaient aux rois, s'ils imitaient tous le danois Borch et le milanais Borri, ces alchimistes qui se jouèrent si complètement de notre Frédéric III."' And in the note: 'Frédéric III fut la dupe de Borch ou Borrichius, chimiste danois, et surtout de Borri, charlatan milanais, qui se disait le favori de l'archange Michel. Cet imposteur, après avoir émerveillé de ses prétendus prodiges Strasbourg et Amsterdam, agrandit la sphère de son ambition et la témérité de ses mensonges; après avoir trompé le peuple, il osa tromper les rois. Il commença par la reine Christine à Hambourg et termina par le roi Frédéric à Copenhague.' Chapter 19.	'Frédéric (III) avoit du goût pour les arts et les sciences.' And in the note: 'Il eut le malheur de se laisser séduire par Borch ou Borrichius, chimiste Danois, qui avoit du savoir, mais surtout par Borri, Milanois de naissance qui se disoit alchimiste, et se vantoit d'être le favori de l'archange Michel qui lui avoit appris de merveilleux secrets. C'étoit l'imposteur de son siècle....Borri opéroit des prodiges, faisoit de l'or, prolongeoit la vie, guérissoit tous les malades qui accouroient de toutes parts à Strasbourg et à Amsterdam où il séjourna longtemps. De là il vint à Hambourg où il trouva la reine Christine, qu'il encensa et persuada aussi longtemps qu'elle eut de l'argent. Il passa ensuite en Dannemarc où Frédéric eut la foiblesse de l'accueillir, et le malheur de le croire et de dépenser plusieurs millions avec lui.' Vol. IX, Book 13, pages 145–6.

The figure of the mortuary-keeper who becomes Ordener's companion on his journey in search of Han is very like some of Scott's Latin-quoting characters[1] but Spiagudry is still more of a pedant. He spends his free time amassing information of all kinds[2] and brings his services to the notice of the King.

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
'Benignus Spiagudry, médecin, antiquaire, sculpteur, minéralogiste, naturaliste, botaniste, légiste, chimiste, mécanicien, physicien, astronome, théologien, grammairien...expose que c'est lui...qui a découvert...que le vrai nom d'Odin est Frigge, fils de Fridulph...que le golphe nommé Otte-Sund s'appelait autrefois Limfiord et n'a pris le nom d'Otte-Sund qu'après qu'Othon le Roux y jetait sa lance....' Chapter 7.	'Son véritable nom (d'Odin) étoit Frigge, fils de Fridulph.' Vol. I, page 53. 'Othon...vint en Dannemarc (974)... arrêté par le golphe nommé Limfiord... il jeta, dit-on, sa lance dans la partie de ce golphe qui a toujours porté depuis ce temps-là le nom de détroit d'Othon (Otte-Sund).' Vol. III, page 61.

Some of Spiagudry's private notes are found by his servant Oglypiglap who deciphers the disconnected phrases with difficulty, since the manuscript is discoloured by sea-water.

---

[1] Cf. Maigron, *op. cit.*, page 165.

[2] *Han d'Islande*, chapter 6.

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
'Rudbeck, Saxon le grammairien... Thormodus Thorfaeus; Isleif, évêque de Scalholt, premier historien islandais.... Frode le savant.' Odin consultait la tête de Mimer, sage.—(Mahomet et son pigeon....') Chapter 46.	'Le célèbre Rudbeck.' Vol. I, page 37. 'Après avoir exclu ces prétendus guides, il ne me reste qu'à choisir entre Saxon le Grammairien et Thormodus Torfaeus.' Vol. I, pages 39–40. 'Ce premier historien Islandois est Isleif, évêque de Scalholt.' Vol. I, page 46. 'Son compatriote Are, surnommé Frode ou le Savant....' Vol. II, page 361. 'Un des artifices qu'il (Odin) employa avec le plus de succès...étoit de consulter dans les affaires difficiles la tête d'un certain Mimer qui avoit eu pendant sa vie une grande réputation de sagesse. Cet homme ayant eu la tête coupée, Odin la fit embaumer et sut persuader aux Scandinaves qu'il lui avoit rendu la parole par ses enchantemens. ... Un artifice semblable rappelle le pigeon qui portoit à Mahomet les ordres du ciel.' Vol. I, page 61.

It is Spiagudry also who reads an extract from the Edda in an ancient history while on duty as guardian of the 'Spladgest.'

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
'Il s'était arrêté à ce passage lugubre de Thormodus Torfaeus, "Quand un homme allume sa lampe, la mort est chez lui avant qu'elle soit éteinte."' Chapter 6.	'Quand un homme allume du feu, la mort est chez lui avant qu'il soit éteint[1].' Vol. II under 'Un autre poème qui entroit dans l'Edda de Saemund....'

He is acquainted with the gods of the North:

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
'Laissez en paix ce respectable descendant du dieu Thor.' Chapter 1.	'La troisième divinité principale des anciens scandinaves se nommoit Thor.' Vol. I, page 78.
'La statue de la Justice, qui fut jadis Freya.' Chapter 28.	'Fréya est la plus favorable des déesses.' Vol. II, page 136.

and with the ancient history of Denmark, though his information is not always taken from Mallet[2].

Characters other than Spiagudry refer to the history and mythology of their country, and the fisherman Braal swears by the ancient King of his land.

---

[1] Also quoted in Diderot et d'Alembert, *Encyclopédie*, Article *Islande*, among 'maximes les plus remarquables du second morceau de l'Edda de Saemond Sigfusson.'

[2] *Han d'Islande*, chapters 19 and 46.

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
'Par la couronne de Gormon le Vieux.' Chapter 27.	'Gormon surnommé le Vieux XXII Roi (an de N. S. 820).' Vol. III, Book 1, page 44.

Han, condemned to be hanged by the neck until death ensues, is happy that his spirit will not pass into the Purgatory reserved for the souls of weak and feeble mortals.

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
'Allons je suis sûr maintenant de ne point aller dans le Niffleim,' and in a footnote, 'Selon les croyances populaires, le Niffleim était l'enfer de ceux qui mouraient de maladie et de vieillesse[1].' Chapter 45.	'Le Nifleim...étoit un séjour composé de neuf mondes, réservé à tous ceux qui mouroient de maladie et de vieillesse.' Vol. II, page 201.

Very general and commonplace information about Norway and Northern countries is difficult to trace to any one definite source but Mallet is possibly responsible for the allusions in *Han d'Islande* to Druidic monuments and runic characters.

Han d'Islande.	Mallet.
'Trois pierres longues et massives, posées debout sur le sol, en soutenaient une quatrième, large et carrée, comme trois piliers portant un toit....' Chapter 29.	'On trouve encore ça et là en Dannemarc, en Suède et en Norvège, au milieu d'une plaine ou sur quelque colline, des autels autour desquels on s'assembloit pour les sacrifices...; trois longs rochers dressés sur la pointe servent de base à une grande pierre....' Vol. I, pages 103–4.
'On trouve sur les bords du golfe, à notre gauche, une profusion de pierres runiques, sur lesquelles on peut étudier des caractères tracés, suivant les traditions, par les dieux et les géants.' Chapter 12.	'Odin étoit aussi l'inventeur des caractères runiques, ou des lettres dont les peuples se sont longtemps servis.' Vol. I, page 61 etc.

This study of one alone of Victor Hugo's sources for *Han d'Islande* suggests that he did not exaggerate in speaking of the time he spent in collecting his materials. In a certain sense the mass of information seems to be undigested, since he so often borrows word for word and paragraph for paragraph. On the other hand unless he had been saturated with the historic facts given by Mallet and had made them his own, he could not so intimately have interwoven fiction and history. It is thus that Victor Hugo justified his claim to have spent much time and careful thought in distributing the materials in hand and in fitting them into his scheme.

---

[1] It was this mention of the Nifleim which led M. Berret to suppose that Victor Hugo had used Mallet's History. Cf. *Le Moyen Age*, *op. cit.*: 'Le Nystheim, c'est bien là le texte, non seulement de la première édition dont il a dénoncé et honni les fautes typographiques mais de la page 155 de l'édition de Lecointe et Duray, quai des Grands Augustins, "la nouvelle édition, *revue avec soin*, la seule que j'avoue..."' and again, 'C'est là une erreur de lecture révélatrice; il a confondu le st et le fl des éditions du 18^e siècle...et cette constatation m'amène à croire qu'en ce qui regarde l'Edda mythologique, la source principale de Victor Hugo fut la seconde partie de *L'Introduction à l'Histoire de Dannemarc...*'

M. Berret indeed traces the mythology of the Scandinavian poems of the *Légende des Siècles* to this source, but it can be proved that it is rather from Eckstein's translations from the Edda in the *Annales de la Littérature et des Arts* that the quotations from the Edda used in *Han d'Islande* are taken.

Moreover, Mallet's History, bulky work as it is, furnishes only part of the history and local colour in *Han d'Islande*; we must look elsewhere not only for further historical details but also for geographical and literary sources[1].

BEATRICE C. SETH-SMITH.

ENGLEFIELD GREEN.

---

[1] These are at present under consideration. Until the investigation has been completed any discussion of Victor Hugo's method of adapting his sources would be premature.

ANGLO-NORMAN POEMS IN A DUBLIN MANUSCRIPT.

In the first part of my *Inventaire des anciens manuscrits de Dublin* I described briefly the Anglo-Norman contents of MS. C. 4. 2 (No. 312) of the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. In a courteous review (*Romania* XLIV, 1915, pp. 131—135) of my work M. A. Långfors offered some suggestions concerning two of the pieces indicated by me, and hence a thorough investigation of these poems is desirable.

The MS. is a vellum quarto of 184 numbered leaves, written in an English hand of the latter part of the fourteenth century. After several Latin tracts[1] there commences, on f. 46 *b*, an Anglo-Norman poem written in double columns and without any title:

Sage est qi sen escript
Il fet a plusors grant profist etc.

M. Långfors (*op. cit.*, p. 132) pointed out that these two verses are identical with the first two of the *Vie de saint Georges*, a poem in 1711 lines by Simund de Freine (ed. Matzke, *Soc. des Anciens Textes Français*, 1909, pp. 61—117), and suggested that our poem might be an incomplete copy of the latter work. On comparing the two, however, I find that the equivalence is limited to the first two verses, and that our poem has nothing to do with Saint George. I give here the beginning and end of the poem, which contains 337 lines:

f. 46 *b* Sage est qi sen escript,
Il fet a plusors grant profist;
Pur ceo vous voil un poi toucher,
Si le vous plest escoter.
Qe cendres es devez penser,
Et a cendres devetz returner.
Tut cest an sumes passe,
Et veu avoum lez iours de este,
Les uns beaux et delitouse,
Les autres horribles et hydouse,

---

[1] The Latin contents of the MS. consist for the most part of prose treatises of the 13th and 14th centuries of a liturgical and theological nature, but there are also some rhythmical hymns. At the bottom of f. 123 *b* the scribe has written a short prayer in English.

De grant tempes e de escleire,
De pluvie, de vent e de tonere,
De yver qi ad este pluviouse
Qe lez chemyns ad fet tayus,
Et de la nativite
Avoum veu la iolivete,
Et sumes tant avant passe
Qe en seint temps sumes entre.
Ore ait chescun en pense,
Cel an avant qe est ale...... 20
f. 49 *b* Et com en ventre fuist nurry,
Ne l'oblez pas ieo vous enpri,
Qe cendres es devetz penser,
Et a cendres devetz returner. 337

This poem is immediately followed by another in 333 lines, which is also without title:

f. 49 *b* Ore escutez lais e clers
Ceste romaunce qe vint apers[1],
Coment vous devietz estre confes,
Et de toutz voz pecches aveir reles.
Dieu qi pur nous suffri passioun
Servir lui devom od grant devotiun;
En iunes en orisounes en vellez en plours[2]
Devum nous despender totz noz labours...... 8
f. 52 a Car certein sumes qe murrum,
Coment ne qant nous ne savum,
Car le temps del homme pase
Com la nue qe le vent chace,
Et que ceo pensast povre avereit,
Et le meutz de pecche se gardereit. 333
Explicit quidam tractatus.

This poem is followed by a Latin tract, ff. 52 *a*—57 *b*: Incipit tractatus fratris Hugonis de Scotia de Otiositate Hominis. Quid hic statis tota die otiosi, II° Parab.[3] Deus patrum nostrorum in cuius manu est omnis potestas...... This work is not in Migne and I have not hitherto met with it elsewhere. The author, Hugh of Scotland, appears to be unknown to Fabricius, Tanner, Chevalier, etc.

After a further series of Latin ecclesiastical tracts, there comes on ff. 140 *a*—143 *b*, without any title, the Anglo-Norman poem on the Vision of Tundal published by V. H. Friedel[4] (*La Vision de Tondale*, Paris, 1907, pp. 63—86). This is the one copy known and it is, unfortunately, imperfect, only 363½ verses remaining. How many folios have been lost between f. 143 *b* and 144 *a* (on which commences an anonymous Latin commentary on the Gospel of St John) it is impossible to say.

---

[1] *The MS. has* a$\overset{s}{p}$s.
[2] *The MS. has* plu$\overset{o}{r}$s.
[3] Cf. Matth. 20, 6.
[4] On this edition see Paul Meyer, *Romania*, 1907, t. XXXVI, p. 335.

M. Friedel (p. 67) thinks we have about a third of the whole. This being the unique MS. the editor claimed to have reproduced its readings with absolute fidelity. That he has not done so will be evident from the following collation of the whole: 7 MS. lez, ed. les; 10 MS. fatees, ed. faites; 10 MS. playn, ed. plain; 22 MS. entere, ed. entre; 43 MS. lez, ed. les; 44 MS. conmu, ed. connu; 45 MS. lez, ed. les; 48 MS. mekerdy, ed. mekerdi; 48 MS. vassall, ed. vasall; 49 MS. cesmal, ed. cest mal; 56 MS. dist, ed. dit; 57 MS. lui, ed. luy; 80 MS. meskerdi, ed. mescerdi; 90 MS. turner, ed. tourner; 108 MS. denferen, ed. d'enfern; 113 MS. disordines, ed. disordinez; 117 MS. solies, ed. soliez; 119 MS. un estail, ed. un' estail'; 119 MS. lez, ed. les; 120 MS. asseez esgardez fichez, ed. asseez fichez; 124 MS. aprocha forment, ed. forment aprocha; 128 MS. le aungel, ed. l'aungel; 130 MS. meinne, ed. nomne; 134 MS. appellez, ed. appelez; 134 MS. faistez, ed. faisteiz; 138 MS. comforta, ed. conforta; 146 MS. lez, ed. les; 147 MS. lez, ed. les; 172 MS. numbreez sont, ed. sont nombreez; 187 MS. lez, ed. les; 189 MS. maufes, ed. maufez; 192 MS. lez, ed. les; 195 MS. lez, ed. les; 196 MS. autres, ed. autrez; 208 MS. lez, ed. les; 208 MS. cheitiues, ed. cheities; 208 MS. aleint, ed. aleiunt; 211 MS. qi, ed. qe; 211 MS. lez, ed. les; 231 MS. graunt, ed. garaunt; 240 MS. un, ed. un'; 243 MS. lez, ed. les; 244 MS. qi, ed. qe; 245 MS. entres, ed. entrez; 250 MS. lez, ed. les; 251 MS. pes, ed. pez; 251 MS. tournes, ed. tournez; 252 MS. fermes, ed. fermez; 256 MS. lez, ed. les; 256 MS. lount, ed. sount; 261, 262, 265, MS. lez, ed. les; 266 MS. Kaunt, ed. Qaunt; 275 MS. lez, ed. les; 279 MS. entres, ed. entrez; 281 MS. ordines, ed. ordinez; 290 MS. lez, ed. les; 291 MS. meintenaunt, ed. maintenaunt; 293 MS. des chenes, ed. de chenes; 296 MS. lez, ed. les; 296 MS. coles, ed. colez; 303 MS. illoqe, ed. illoque; 304 MS. liuerez, ed. liurez; 305 MS. fut, ed. fu; 306 MS. le, ed. la; 307 MS. ouertes, ed. ouertez; 314 MS. lai, ed. lac; 318 MS. lez, ed. les; 318 MS. deuourir, ed. denourir; 321 MS. fere, ed. fer; 322 MS. pes, ed. pez; 326 MS. passere, ed. passer; 327 MS. fait, ed. fet; 329 MS. lez, ed. les; 329 MS. ount, ed. ouut; 332 MS. lez, ed. les; 337 MS. solū, ed. solun; 339 MS. seint', ed. seint; 347 MS. wache, ed. vache; 356 MS. wache, ed. vache; 357 MS. viuere, ed. viure.

On ff. 145 *a*—146 *a*, written in double columns, is found an unpublished Anglo-Norman *Oreisun de Noustre Dame* (cf. Långfors, *Romania*, XLIV, 1915, p. 132), in 186 octosyllabics. As it is short and not devoid of linguistic interest I reproduce it below, conforming as closely as possible to the orthography of the MS. There is no title. In several places the original text has been erased and other readings sub-

stituted in a contemporary hand, which has also inserted a number of words and corrections.

f. 145 *a* Pretiose dame, seinte Marie,
Mere dieu espouse e amye, [*erased and re-written*]
Pucele franche e alose,
E de la grace deux enlumine,
Pur la ioie ke avies en tere
Ke totz iours vous ert plenere [*er. and re-wr.*]
Ayez pite de moy chettif doleruse,
Alures ne say vus quere sucurs,
Si a vous noun tre duce Marie, [*er. and re-wr.*]
De ducur e de pite tute repleine,
Ke estes ioie a celestiens
E vie duce a cristiens,
As orphanins e povres estes succurrabels,
As chaitifs e a peccheurs estes merciables,
As dolens ioie delitable,
As bosonnus mult profitable,
A vous amauns mult amiable,
Envers voster filz tute tens aydable ; [*er. and r.*]
Vous estes du cel la reyne,
Tute la curt vers vous encline ;
Vous estes mere e pucele
Sur tutes creatures la plus bele ;
Unkes ne fu tun pier crie,
Ne ia n'ert al mund trove.
A vous servent les aungles du cel [*addition inserted*]
Et tute la court celestiel.
Vous estes de tuz biens la racine
E de tuz mauz veraie medicine. [*add. ins.*]
Vous estes a tuz ceus drue e amie [*correction made*]
Ke lessent pecche e folie.
Mult parfunt ceuz benurez
Ke de vous, madame, sont amez. [*add. ins.*]
Vous estes plaine de pite
E mer de mercie a droit nome
Ke a Teofle faystes succurs
Ke rena ton fiz par ses folurs ; [*add. ins.*]
E la egypcien Marie
Ke mult estoit de sole vie
Ke vous resutes en plegage [*orig. reading* recutes]
Devaunt voster seinte ymage ;
E le moyne qe en l'ewe pery [*add. ins.*]
Par vous, madame, vint a mercy ; [*add. ins.*]
E le clerke ke iadys neya
En disaunt 'ave Maria' ;
E le abbesse engrosse
Par vous, madame, fust deluere ;
Et plusures autres, tres douce Marie,
Par vous sunt venus de mort a vie.
Nuls ne put dire les grant bienes
Ke fetes sovent a cristienes.
Qant ieo recorde vous grant bountez
Ne me despayre pur mes pecchez.
f. 145 *b* Deu say ke unkes nule ne pery
Ke se mist, dame, en voster merci.

42 madame] *the MS. has* ma made.

Tre duce dame, tre duce Marie,
De tute me meth en ta baillie;
Cors e alme a vous commaunde
Voster amur pur en moun vivaunde.
De tus biens fu desherite,
Povre, destrute e degaste,
Madame aez de moy pite,
De conseil sui ieo mult esgarre,
Ne say ou aler ne ke fere
Ffors a vous dame debonere.
Des biens dont avez grant plente
Partiez ou moy par charite;
Tant cum plus a peccheures partez
Si acressent plus voz bountes. [*corr. made*]
Le grant bien qe en vous est
Tuz ioures multiplie e crest.
Deux vous a fest a la manere,
De tuz biens est vous plenere.
Merci vous cri pur deux amour
Ke vous a fest si grant honure.
Aydez moy e mayntenez
Ke ieo [ne] soy de vous privez.
Madame merci, seinte Marie,
Des ordes pecches e de folies
Ke ieo ay feste en cest vie
Me deluerez la deux amye.
A vous me pleing e atendye,
Pur dieux amour ieo vous empri.
A moy pardonez mes pecches
Ke pleine su de iniquitez.
Madame a vous est moun resu
Ke trueres pur moy a duce Ihesu,
Ke si cher nous rechata,
Qant sa vie pur nous dona,
K'il nous doynt veray compunction,
Repentaunce e confeccioun,
E qe ieo puys en cest vie
Espener mes maus e ma folie [*er. and corr.*]
Dount ieo su ore angusse,
Dolent e triste e ire.
Madame a ky le mund apent
Ffetes a voster fiz present [*er.*]
De moy e priez par grant succur
Ke il me receive en bone amur,
E ke ieo des ore metz soy
En soun servise en droit voy,
E ke li deble orde ne ayt poeste
De ma char frele e malure,
Ne le mund par son desire
Ne me face de li partir.
Defende moy seinte Marie
De pecchez e de vilanie.
Requerez Ihesu voster fiz
Ke ieo say de ses eliz,
Ke il m'a pardonne mes pecchez [*er. and corr.*]
Dont sui digne ester dampnez.
Tant vous ayme li haut sire

94 *The MS. has* Dolent "e ire" e triste.

Ne vous veut de ren encounter dire. [*er. and corr.*]
Madame mustrez a voster filz cher
Les mameles ke il deina leter,
E le douce venter ou il vist
Kant en cest mond apparust,
De vous beles oez le regardez,
E vous beles maynes vers lui levez,
E requerez de quere pitus
Ke il ayte mercie de nous.
De moy chaitif eez pite
E merci dame benure.
f. 146 *a* Pur la amour voster fiz Ihesu
Donez moy grace e vertu,
Fforce e vigur enterine
De lui e vous servir sanz fin.
Apres ceste mortele vie
Receif m'alme en ta companie,
E si recordez, mere de glore,
De ceux ke me unt en memore,
Especialment fetes succures
A touz qe me ayment en bone amurs
Ke pur vous ayent alegaunce,
Ke en mes priers unt affiance,
E de ceux prenes vous pite
Ki par ma folie unt pecche,
E de touz cristiens ensement
Ke volunte unt de amendement
A voster fiz vous acordez,
E de tutes maus deluerez,
Pur les almes ke sount departiez
Doucement requerez toun fiz
Ke il les meyne hors de payne
A la grant ioye soveraine.
Merci vous crie, madame, ades
A grant bosoyne nous soez pres.
Qant de ci irray a dolur,
A cel hure me fetes succur,
Ke dignement pus le corps user
Dunt voster fiz me deygna rechatter,
Et le saut benoyt autersi
Ke pur moy chaytif espandie
Receyves m'alme en ta baillie
Qant el ert dal cors partie,
Ke li orde deble n'ayt poeste
A demustrer sa cruelte.
Mercie vous crie, douce Marie,
Ore ne dunk ne me obliez mie, [*add. ins.*]
Requerez Ihesu voster fiz
Ke ieo say de ses eliz
Par sa merci, par sa duceur,
Et par voster saynte amour.
Ma douce dame merci vous cri,
Grantez moy qe il soyt issi
Seinz e seintes communement
Qant la dame veez en present,
Pur la ioye ke de lui avez,
Pur nous cheitifes la requeres,
Ke el nous soit envers dieu ei aye
De venir a voster compaynnie. Amen.

Grace vous renk tut pusaunt pere,
Verray salu de m'alme liverer
Ke cest nuyte me avez garde
Et par ta merci sauve ;
Ore te prie par ta merci
Otriez moy d'espender ici
Iceo iour ke est a venir
E toun service e a toun plaisir,
En verray humilite,
E pur profite e charite,
E purete de cors e de quer,
Grauntez moy ceo iour passer,
Ke moun servise vous soyt a gre,
Ke en male ne turne ne en pecche [*er.*]
Mes seyn e sauf de encombrer
Toun noun benoyt puys loer. Amen.

171—186] *Apparently to be separated from the preceding, but there is no break whatever in the MS.*

171 renk] *the MS. has* re'nk. 178 plaisir] *the MS. has* plaiser.

The only other French pieces in the MS. are in prose:

f. 147 *a*—147 *b*: Seinte Margarete, duce pucele, amye Ihesu Crist, pucele qe en cele estes corone, en tere estes honure, merci vous cri madame cher oyet bonement ma prier......tel pite ayet ke par vous sentte aloynes de pecchez et de tutes malurez. Amen Pater Noster.

f. 158 *a*, six lines: Quayntyse par ffausyne, Richesse par larcyne......

ff. 158 *a*—159 *b*: Ffrere tout tout (*sic*) pussaunt, seyngur drayturel, roy de misericord, trinite parfit......issi soummes deluerez par vous de toutes maus.

f. 167 *a*: Cest orisoun disaite seynte Gile pur l'alme soun per chescun iour en le ane qe estoit en enfern......

M. Esposito.

Dublin.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

THE SHIFT IN THE VALUE OF ENGLISH VOWELS.

I HAVE read with interest Mr Allen Mawer's review of Dr Zachrisson's work on the shift in pronunciation of the English vowels. I do not doubt that the early date assigned for it is correct. Perhaps the most decisive of the few direct indications that have come down to us is to be found in a passage (not I gather quoted by Zachrisson) from Sir Thomas Smith's *De restauratâ et emendatâ linguæ Græcæ pronuntiatione* [p. 15, Paris, 1568]:

> Recte etiam fortasse nunc *Domine ne in furori* per E Italicum, non quemadmodum diu per illud E Anglicum quod in Bee dicimus, aut me, cum ε̆με nostro more loquamur, observatur.

It appears from this passing observation that a special 'English' pronunciation of the long E, which it would be absurd to suppose was not in the direction of our modern pronunciation, had in mid-sixteenth century been 'long' established, and so completely, as to have drawn with it a similar pronunciation of Church Latin. Smith is here approving a recent reversion for Church purposes to the continental fashion; a change, he goes on to say, brought about since the time of Dean Colet, who would have been horrified to hear it. I believe I was the first to call attention to this passage, in a Cambridge Essay of mine of 1862, p. 93, n.

GEORGE YOUNG.

FORMOSA FISHERY, COOKHAM.

VERSES ON 'THE BEE.'

The above verses have often been attributed to the Earl of Essex, but Mr R. Warwick Bond has shown good reasons for assigning them to John Lyly. In his edition of Lyly's *Works*, vol. III, p. 445, he states those reasons, and at p. 494 he prints a version corresponding in the main with that which is here noted, but with an extra stanza following stanza 4. At p. 445 he gives in a note a list of all the MS. copies known to him, thirteen in number, to which we may now add another copy. At pp. 494—497 are marginal references to *Euphues* and other works of Lyly where similar passages occur, and in footnotes are given the principal variants in the MSS. consulted. Mr Bond's version is printed from Egerton MS. 923, ff. 5—7. The version here supplied has recently been found by me among a number of charters and other legal documents relating to the manors of Amcotts and Kettlethorpe in Lincolnshire, belonging to Mr Weston Cracroft, and which were in the hands of the late Edward Peacock, F.S.A., at the time of his death in 1915. It is written in an Elizabethan hand on a sheet of paper on which are also paraphrases of the *Credo* and the *Pater noster*, the interest of which is theological rather than literary. It has been presented by Mr Cracroft to the Bodleian Library, and may henceforth be known as the 'Amcotts MS.' The principal variants from the Egerton MS. printed by Mr Bond are these:

		Title] Verses made by the Erle of Essex.
St. I	3	the...gan] my...did.
	4	that] the.
St. II	1	thus...busd] this...buze.
	3	lazie...lure] basest...leve.
	6	complain'd vnto] cōplayned to.
St. III	1	My leige god grant] God gr^{a}unt my leige.
	,,	haue no] neu$^{?}$.
	3	Synce] ffor.
	4	Attomies] Attomes.
St. IV	1	word clipt] clipped.
	2	creepe] stoup.
	3	disputeth] dissenteth.
	4	asking] asketh.
	5	I for a tyme] a tyme I me.
	6	Hemlock, Nettles] nettlꝭ hemlockꝭ.
St. v]		*deest.*
St. VI]	1	Moone] th mone.
	3	sitt] teeke.
	5	they] the.
	6	fullnes...on] sweetnes...in.
St. VII	1	they] the.
	2	from the] one a.
	4	scorne] storme.
	5	envy] me envie.
St. VIII	1	or] &.
	2	sperit] speritt ꝭ.
St. IX	1	of] for.
St. X	3	myne] my.
	3	prince his] p^{r}incꝭ.
	5	an] one.
	6	shall...shall] may...may.
St. XI	1	must...grate] moves...great.
	2	fretteth] frettꝭ me.
	3	bred vp] bret.
	4	fruit] flower.
	6	doe frett] will eat.
St. XII	2	beasts] bease.
	,,	Lilly] lyllies.
	3	&] no^{r}.
	4	for] to.
	5	takes] take.
St. XIII	1	This] Tis.
	,,	draine] drayne the.
	2	they] the.
	3	&] the.
	4	and...nightshade] to...lotos.
	,,	the] their.
	6	witching] Wishinge.
St. XIV	1	mens] my.
	3	if] thoughe.
	4	my] thy.
	5	vertuous] vertues.
	,,	graued] carved.
	6	worlds but] wo^{r}ld is.
St. XV	1	p^{r}fume] pfumed.
	3	dreames of] dreame one.
	,,	p^{r}sume] p^{r}sumed.
	4	mongst...thoughe] amongst ...thought.
	,,	were] , was.
	6	y^{e}] my.

J. T. Fowler.

Winterton, Doncaster.

HORATIO AND THE GHOST IN 'HAMLET.'

A SIDE-NOTE ON THE CURRENT CONTROVERSY.

No more fascinating or important problem has been discussed in the *Modern Language Review* than that raised in the controversy on 'Hamlet's Hallucination' between Dr Greg and Mr Dover Wilson. May I fix attention on one point which has not been clearly grasped, it seems to me, by either disputant? It materially concerns Dr Greg's summary treatment of Horatio, whom he charges with 'indulging in mere imaginative rhetoric' in the lines about the dead King's armour and his angry parle with the sledded Polacks on the ice.

'Observe,' he says, 'that both here and in that interview [with Hamlet, Act I, Scene ii] he constantly speaks as though he were intimately familiar with the appearance of the late King of Denmark. Yet incidentally he lets out that, so far from this being the case, he had only set eyes on him on a single occasion: "I saw him *once*; he was a goodly king!"' (pp. 408–9).

Mr Wilson replies to this with general considerations. Horatio may have heard from Marcellus and Bernardo about the armour; kings are well known to their subjects; coins and pictures make their features sufficiently familiar. This is true: but it is unsafe in a disputed passage to press generalities which the poet has ignored. Mr Wilson meets the point more definitely when he quotes Horatio's description of the Ghost's frowning face, marked with intense sorrow and very pale:

> *Hamlet.* Then saw you not his face?
> *Horatio.* O, yes, my lord; he wore his beaver up.

'After all this,' Mr Wilson says, 'should it strain our credulity overmuch to suppose that, although he had only seen the late King once, Horatio recognised him again as the Ghost?' (p. 135). But Horatio had seen the dead King more than once. When he first informs Hamlet of the Ghost's appearance he ends thus:

> And I with them the third night kept the watch,
> Where, as they had delivered, both in time,
> Form of the thing, each word made true and good,
> The Apparition comes: *I knew your father;*
> *These hands are not more like.*

The gesture of the outspread hands points the statement with peculiar vividness. It is much too emphatic to ignore.

Does it contradict the earlier reference to Horatio's having seen the King 'once'? I think not if the passage is examined: I quote it from the Second Quarto. Hamlet, after his irony about the funeral baked-meats, relapses into the note of reverie :

> My father, me thinkes I see my father.
> *Hora.* Where my Lord ?
> *Ham.* In my mindes eye *Horatio.*
> *Hora.* I saw him once, a was a goodly King.
> *Ham.* A was a man take him for all in all
> I shall not looke vppon his like againe.
> *Hora.* My Lord I thinke I saw him yesternight.

When Horatio says,

> I saw him once, a was a goodly King,

he is beginning another of his descriptive reminiscences confined to a definite occasion, like the reference to the angry parle. But to Hamlet the phrase 'a goodly King' seems cold and weak : he interrupts Horatio, and all his love and reverence for his father shine out in that sudden tribute. Note that Hamlet's speech is delivered without a break in the Quarto text—'trippingly on the tongue.' Horatio, instead of picking up the dropped thread, catches at the clue supplied by '*look upon* his like.' His interrupted speech should be printed in a modernized text,

> I saw him once—a' was a goodly king—

to show that Hamlet cuts him short. There is no inconsistency.

PERCY SIMPSON.

OXFORD.

BEN JONSON ON ELIZABETHAN TRANSLATIONS OF HOMER AND VIRGIL.

In the course of his conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden, Ben Jonson remarked 'that the translations of Homer and Virgill in long Alexandrines were but prose.' What were the translations here referred to ? David Laing, who in 1842 edited the *Conversations* for the Shakespeare Society, was of opinion[1] that the Virgil translation alluded to by Jonson was that of Phaer, which was completed by Thomas Twine in 1584. To this no objection can be made, for even if Phaer's labours were commended by Nash, Puttenham and Arthur Hall, Jonson's verdict was undoubtedly just.

But when Laing proceeds to state that the translation of Homer mentioned must be Chapman's, we feel that he is on insecure ground. The friendly relations which existed between Jonson and Chapman make such a curt judgment seem unlikely, even if allowance is made for the epigrammatic turn of the *Conversations.* The well-known story which tells how Jonson voluntarily joined his collaborator Chapman in gaol when the latter had been arrested for writing *Eastward Hoe* and their second imprisonment in 1605 corroborate Ben's statement that Chapman was 'loved of him.' *A priori*, therefore, it does not seem probable that Jonson would so summarily dismiss the work of a highly esteemed friend and collaborator, who was, like himself, an accomplished classical scholar. This first impression is borne out by another passage in the *Conversations* where Chapman's Homer is mentioned by name. 'Sir Edward Wotton's verses of a happie lyfe,' says Drummond, 'he hath by heart; and a peice of Chapman's translation of the 13 of the Iliads, which he thinketh well done.' It is astonishing that Laing did not see how absolutely these words contradict his explanation.

---

[1] p. 3, note.

However, if the translation of Homer in question is not Chapman's, whose is it? Undoubtedly that of Arthur Hall, who in 1581 published a rendering of the first ten books of the Iliad, based on the French version of Hugues Salel. His lines are of fourteen syllables, or the 'long Alexandrines' which Jonson speaks of. The prosaic character of his work may be illustrated by the following specimens:

> The valiant Knights the two Aiax on th'other partie doe it,
> With Diomede and Vlysses they pray the Greekes stande to it.
>
> If yee thinke good, to Countrey home I wil them wil to hie,
> And with faire words wil counsayle them, & willing seeme, wil I.
>
> Who now long sith, when we in peace and suretie al did swim,
> Was vnto me brother in law, and I sister to him.
>
> Againe Priam perceiuing well, that thus this geare would fodge,
> Said to the Greekes and Troyans both, I thinke it best I trodge.

There would surely be more point in Ben Jonson's criticising these wretched lines than the stately verse of Chapman. Moreover, assuming that he was referring to Hall in the *Conversations,* he was in complete agreement with Chapman who in the preface to *Achilles' Shield* (1598) himself speaks contemptuously of Homer's having 'been born so lame and defective, as the French midwife had brought him forth.' Does not all this warrant the conclusion that in making the statement reported by Drummond the redoubtable Ben was concurring in the verdict already passed by Chapman and not indulging in harsh and unjust criticism of a friend?

HERBERT WRIGHT.

BANGOR.

MATTHEW ARNOLD'S 'EAST AND WEST.'

Matthew Arnold's sonnet *East and West* first appeared in *New Poems* in 1867. It is therefore the fruit of the Celtic studies which were occupying his mind about this period. From a reference in his published correspondence to Renan's views on the Celtic races, we gather that in 1859, and indeed even earlier, Arnold had begun to take an interest in the relations between Celt and Saxon. Writing to his sister in December of that year, he said, "The best book of his (Renan's) for you to read...is his *Essais de Morale et de Critique*, lately published. I have read few things for a long time with more pleasure than a long essay with which the book concludes—'Sur la poésie des races celtiques.' I have long felt that we owed far more, spiritually and artistically, to the Celtic races than the somewhat coarse Germanic intelligence readily perceived, and been increasingly satisfied at our own semi-Celtic origin[1]." In the summer of 1864 Arnold stayed at Llandudno and, as he rambled through the mountains of Snowdonia, drank deep of their perennial beauty. It was this contact with the home of Welsh literature and Welsh traditions that brought to fruition his long-cherished affection for the literature of the Celts. The result is seen in his Oxford lectures on Celtic literature which finally appeared in book form in 1867, some few months before the poem we have under consideration.

As Arnold lay on Great Orme's Head and looked out towards Anglesey, he could see 'Pen-mon, Seiriol's isle and priory.' It is this Seiriol who, along with his fellow-countryman Cybi, figures in *East and West.*

They are two of the most famous saints in the history of Anglesey. The former, who flourished in the early part of the sixth century, was placed by his uncle Einion, King of Lleyn, at the head of the college of Penmon, not far from Beaumaris. This institution, afterwards known as Cor Seiriol, acquired great celebrity and was even frequented by the Scandinavians who settled in Scotland and the Isle of Man. At the northern end of Menai Straits and just off the headland of Penmon lies a small island now known as Puffin Island. Its older name was Priestholme, which it evidently owed to the Scandinavians who visited it[2]. In Welsh it is now called Ynys Seiriol after the old saint of that name.

Cybi was a contemporary of Seiriol and his name is connected with Holyhead, which in Welsh is called Caergybi. It was here that Cybi founded a religious society, at the head of which he placed himself.

---

[1] *Letters of Matthew Arnold*, 1848—1888, Vol. 1, pp. 111–12.

[2] Cf. *New English Dictionary*, Vol. 5, p. 343, under the heading *holm*.

The legend on which *East and West* is based appears at least as early as 1766 in Henry Rowlands' *Mona antiqua illustrata* (p. 144 note), the reference being apparently due to Henry Owen, the editor of this second edition. But the tradition is probably even older and has been handed down to the present day. It will not be amiss to give the details here, for Matthew Arnold, as we shall see, has completely misunderstood the legend. We are told that once a week Cybi and Seiriol used to meet in the middle of Anglesey at a place called Clorach near Llanerchymedd. At the present day two springs, some ten yards apart, still exist there. One of them bears the name of Ffynnon Seiriol, the other that of Ffynnon Gybi. They were supposed to have healing properties, and even in the early part of the nineteenth century attracted visitors who sought to be cured of their diseases. Seiriol, starting from Penmon towards Clorach, was travelling westwards and had the morning sun behind him. When returning home in the evening his face was once more turned from the sun. Hence in Welsh he is called *Seiriol wyn* or Seiriol the fair. Cybi, coming from Holyhead, faced the sun, and similarly on his homeward journey. In Welsh he is therefore styled *Cybi felyn* or Cybi the brown, that is, the sun-burnt.

It will be perceived that *East and West* reverses the statement of the Welsh legend, which in no way lends itself to Arnold's climax:

> Ah! now 'tis changed. In conquering sunshine bright
> The man of the bold West now comes array'd;
> He of the mystic East is touch'd with night.

The source upon which Arnold drew is a matter of uncertainty. An account of the legend is given by Robert Williams in his *Enwogion Cymru, A Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Welshmen* (1852), but Arnold's mistaken conception of the tradition may be due to an imperfect recollection of information acquired during his travels in North Wales or to the faulty narrative of some guide book[1].

HERBERT WRIGHT.

BANGOR.

'LORD RANDAL.'

'LORD RANDAL' is the name usually given to an English and Scottish ballad the theme of which is extensively diffused in Europe. The tale is told in such widely different languages as German, Dutch, Swedish, Danish, Magyar, Wendish, and Italian, while in Portugal, Bohemia,

---

[1] I wish to thank the Rev. T. Shankland, Librarian of University College, Bangor, who has kindly placed at my disposal his extensive knowledge of Cambrian lore.

Catalonia, and Provence a story closely analogous to the theme of the English ballad is related. Child in his work on *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads* made a masterly comparative study of the Lord Randal theme[1], and this note will, I trust, call attention to some facts which have been discovered since he wrote.

The ballad is first referred to in a quodlibet printed on a broadside containing the repertoire of a singer called Camillo, who, judging by the date on the sheet, sang it at Verona in 1629[2]. Later in 1656 the ballad was referred to in the Crusca by Canon Lorenzo Panciatichi who together with the academicians present was tempted to commit the error of trying to 'improve' the ballad[3]. In England the history of the ballad cannot be traced earlier than the nineteenth century[4], but that it is a genuinely old ballad can hardly be doubted. In all there exist twenty-five versions of the ballad in English[5], one of which Child derived from an Irish source[6]. I know the ballad to be current in Ireland and I give the following version exactly as I heard it[7]:

'Where were you all day, my own pretty boy?
Where were you all day, my comfort and joy?'
'I was fishing and fowling; mother, make my bed soon,
For I'm sick to the heart, and I want to lie down.'

'What will you leave your father, my own pretty boy?
What will you leave your father, my comfort and joy?'
'My house and my lands; mother, make my bed soon,
For I'm sick to the heart, and I want to lie down.'

'What will you leave your sister, my own pretty boy?
What will you leave your sister, my comfort and joy?'
'My carriage and four, mother, make my bed soon,
For I'm sick to the heart, and I want to lie down.'

'What will you leave your brother, my own pretty boy?
What will you leave your brother, my comfort and joy?'
'My boots and my spurs; mother, make my bed soon,
For I'm sick to the heart, and I want to lie down.'

'What will you leave your wife, my own pretty boy?
What will you leave your wife, my comfort and joy?'
'A rope for to hang her; mother, make my bed soon,
For I'm sick to the heart, and I want to lie down.'

It is interesting for the comparative study of the Lord Randal theme that, since Child wrote his work on the *English and Scottish Popular*

---

[1] Child, *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, Vol. I, pp. 151–157.

[2] Wolff, *Egeria*, p. 53; Martinengo-Caesaresco, *Essays in the Study of Folk-Songs*.

[3] Child, *ibid.*, Vol. I, Introd. to 'Lord Randal.'

[4] Child, *Eng. and Scot. Pop. Ballads* (ed. Sargent and Kittredge, p. 22), London, Nutt, 1906.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 642.

[6] Child, *The Eng. and Scot. Pop. Ballads*, Vol. I, p. 162.

[7] Source as for the ballad of 'The Fause Knight upon the Road,' *Modern Language Review*, Vol. XII, pp. 203–204.

Ballads, there should have been found to exist two versions of the ballad, one in the Irish[1] and the other in the Welsh language[2]. These latter versions like practically all the continental and English versions have a climax which involves the making of a will or testament such as is found also to exist in the ballads of the 'Cruel Brother' and in 'Edward.'

JOSEPH J. MACSWEENEY.

SUTTON, COUNTY DUBLIN.

'MEALY-MOUTHED.'

Dr Bradley's objections to my etymology of *meal-mouth,* based on the name of Henry Millemuth (*Northumb. Assize Rolls,* 1279), appear to be (1) that neither the simplex nor the compound is recorded in O.E., (2) that I am mistaken in the sense that I assign to its early uses.

The first objection is met by the existence of *mildew* in O.E., O.H.G., Sw. and Dan., pointing to the W.Ger. **mili* recognized by Kluge, who also quotes O.N. *milska,* sweet drink, with which cf. O.E. *milisc,* honeyed. It is, I believe, no new thing to infer a simplex from a compound, and Dr Bradley must either admit a cognate of L. *mel* in O.E. or revise the etymology of *mildew* in the *N.E.D.* The non-occurrence of **milmūþ* in what has come down to us of the O.E. vocabulary is not surprising. *Mildew,* describing a familiar agricultural phenomenon, had chances which were denied to a colloquial nickname. To take a parallel from M.E., would any one cast doubts on the nickname of William Schepschank (*Yorks. Poll-tax,* 1379) because the *N.E.D.* does not record *sheepshank* till 1675, or question the identity of *cheesemonger* (*N.E.D.* c. 1510) with the same word used as a surname in the *Pipe Rolls* for 1186? These are random examples of classes of compounds the earlier occurrence of which as surnames I can exemplify by hundreds.

Dr Bradley's second objection is more serious, and the Ger. *mehl im maul behalten,* to avoid giving a decided answer, which he quotes from Luther, certainly agrees more closely with the current sense of *mealy-mouthed.* Perhaps one day we shall find that this also is due to the same development of form and sense which I claim for *mealmouth,* and which has a parallel, for form, in the popular perversions of *mildew* in the Teutonic languages (see *N.E.D.*). My contention is that in the earliest

---

[1] See *Eriu,* Vol. II, pp. 76–81 (1905).

[2] *The Celtic Review,* Vol. II, pp. 297–299 (April, 1906).

N.E.D. quots. *meal-mouthed* means *melliloquus.* The reader can judge for himself:

> When the *meale mouth* hath woon the bottome of your stomake, than will the pick-thanke it tell (1546).
>
> Saying that you had flatterers and *meal-mouthed* merchants in high estimation (1576).

Dr Bradley says that my interpretation is not correct, and that 'a man earns the epithet *mealy-mouthed,* not by what he says, but by what he refrains from saying,' the latter statement being obviously true for current usage. As no modern *ipse dixit* is of any value on the first point, I propose to take the opinions of two Tudor Englishmen. Francis Holyoak, in his edition of Rider's *Lat. Dict.* (1612), has '*meale-mouthed,* perblandus,' apparently contrasted with '*foule-mouthed,* maledicus.' Thomas Thomas, in the 14th ed. of his *Lat. Dict.* (1644), has 'perblandus, very pleasant and courteous in words; *meale-mouthed,* passing faire spoken.' The first edition of Rider is 1589, of Thomas 1587. It would be interesting to know when these glosses first appear. Compare

> Qui n'a argent en bourse, ait du moins du *miel en bouche,* He that hath not meanes to pay, at least must frame his mouth to pray (Cotg.).
>
> *Honig im mund,* und gall im hertzen, A hony-tongue and a heart of gall (Ludwig, *Ger.-Eng. Dict.* 1716).

ERNEST WEEKLEY.

NOTTINGHAM.

ETYMOLOGY OF 'RILE.'

Altered from *roil,* orig. to make (water) turbid, hence to perturb the temper. The *N.E.D.* quotes from Godefroy an obs. F. *ruiler,* to mix mortar. The form suggests F. *rouiller,* to rust (cf. *boil, soil*), which does not, so far as I know, occur in the required sense. But its O.F. derivative *rouil,* mud, fits exactly. It occurs, in the plural, in Beroul's *Tristan*: 'Cist garez est plain de *rouïz*' (l. 3870).

ERNEST WEEKLEY.

NOTTINGHAM.

RECOVERY OF A LOST LEAF IN HARLEIAN MS. 2382.

The existence of an odd leaf in Sloane MS. 297 was noted as early as 1782 in Ayscough's Catalogue, where it is described as 'part of a leaf of old English poetry,' the rest of the volume being a collection of fifteenth century medical treatises. Some time within the last twenty years Mr McCracken pointed out that the 'old English poetry' was a portion of Lydgate's 'Life of Our Lady,' and a marginal entry to that effect was made in the Sloane Catalogues. It was not, however, perceived that this leaf belongs in reality to Harleian MS. 2382.

Its right to a place in the Harleian MS. rests chiefly on evidence of textual correspondence and foliation.

The text on the leaf in the Sloane MS. fits exactly into a gap in the text of MS. Harl. 2382. This leaf is numbered f. 88 in its present place, but this foliation is modern, and the leaf still bears the old number III^{xx}I (i.e. 61) made when it was written. The modern foliation of MS. Harl. 2382 does not notice the gap, but goes straight on from 51, the leaf ending with l. 4228, to 52, the leaf beginning with l. 4299. The old numbering is still legible, and f. 51 is marked III^{xx} (i.e. 60) while f. 52 is III^{xx}II (i.e. 62). The missing leaf, therefore, must have been numbered III^{xx}I, which is the number of the leaf in the Sloane MS.

Additional evidence is forthcoming from identity of handwriting, signs used in indicating the beginnings of stanzas, size of the page, etc.

CECILIA M. FOX.

WALLINGTON, SURREY.

La Source de la Scène des Portraits, dans ‘Hernani.’

Dans le numéro du 11 avril 1830 du journal *Le National*, un rédacteur anonyme, qui pourrait être Armand Carrel lui-même, attaque violemment les prétentions du Romantisme à l'originalité. Il dénonce dans *Hernani* une intrigue usée, de fréquents emprunts de détail; il rend à *Roméo et Juliette* la scène finale de la pièce[1]; quant à la scène ‘si admirée’ des Portraits, il prétend qu'elle vient ‘presque mot pour mot de la tragédie de Shiel, *Evadné*, analysée et publiée partiellement dans la *Revue Trimestrielle* de M. Buchon, cahier de juillet 1828[2].’

Sauf le ‘mot pour mot,’ cette assertion est exacte.

Le premier article du volume, qui s'intitule en titre courant *Etat présent de l'art dramatique en Angleterre*, étudie sept tragédies: *l'Apostat* et *Evadné*, de Shiel; *Mirandola*, de Proctor; *Virginius*, *Caius Gracchus* et *Guillaume Tell*, de Knowles; *Cenci*, de Shelley.

---

[1] *L'Expiation*, de Müllner, publiée en 1823 dans la Collection des Chefs-d'œuvre du théâtre étranger (tome III), et dont on connaît par ailleurs l'influence sur Hugo, présente au dénouement une femme plus résolue qui se tue avant son mari. Le souvenir de cette pièce, qui se termine dans une hallucination de crime, comme *Hernani* dans une extase d'amour, s'est-elle ajoutée à celui de Shakespeare?

[2] *La Revue Trimestrielle*, 1ère année, tome II, no. III, juillet 1828 (Paris, Bossange, 1828. Manque au British Museum). *Hernani* aurait été écrit du 29 août au 25 septembre 1829. Les vers 91—94 du monologue de Charles-Quint proviennent de la pièce des *Feuilles d'automne* intitulée *Ce qu'on entend sur la montagne* et datée dans l'édition du 27 juillet 1829. Cette date reste à contrôler.

Dans *Evadné*, le ministre favori d'un roi de Naples pousse son souverain à une passion déshonorante pour la sœur d'un seigneur de la Cour, auquel il dénonce l'intrigue ; il espère ainsi provoquer l'assassinat de son maître et monter sur le trône. Le frère paraît entrer dans ses vues, feint de consentir à l'amour du roi, prête même sa maison, et il se prépare à frapper les coupables, quand sa sœur l'aperçoit et l'invite à assister, caché, au rendez-vous pris dans la salle des aïeux.

Le marivaudage amoureux, les déclarations passionnées, les résistances pudiques, les promesses royales, se croisent et suivent leur cours, comme dans les scènes de Doña Sol et Hernani; le roi croit son bonheur proche. Il admire la beauté sculpturale d'Evadné ; celle-ci lui montre les statues.

> Belle Evadné, te joues-tu de mon impatience ? Ce n'est pas pour examiner ces marbres inanimés que je viens te visiter ce soir. Je brûle de contempler à loisir ce sein d'albâtre....

Evadné insiste pour qu'il jette les yeux sur 'ces vénérables images qui conservent les traits de *ses* ancêtres.' Et s'approchant d'une statue :

> Voici le glorieux fondateur de ma famille, Rodolphe le Grand. Il fut célèbre dans un âge où les héros remplissaient le monde, et où des faits, aujourd'hui miraculeux, étaient des évènements ordinaires. Charlemagne décora son écu de ce soleil et en fit l'emblème de sa gloire ; car au plus haut de sa course il n'est pas plus éclatant que la renommée sans tache de ce grand homme. De quel air expressif et sévère il soutient ce symbole de pureté et semble demander avec indignation quel rejeton de son noble sang oserait le ternir.
>
> LE ROI. En effet, mais ses traits austères, adoucis par une suite de générations, se sont transformés en ton charmant sourire. Il n'existe entre vous aucune ressemblance.
>
> EVADNÉ. Voilà, Seigneur, un autre de mes ancêtres, Guelfe le Meurtrier.
>
> LE ROI. Le Meurtrier ! J'ignorais que votre famille fût entachée du reproche d'avoir versé le sang.
>
> EVADNÉ. Sa faute, si ce fut une faute, nous attriste, mais ne nous fait pas rougir. Son château était assiégé par les Sarrasins, il avait une fille unique qui lui était plus chère que ne vous l'est votre diadème : mais lorsqu'il vit les infidèles en fureur s'élancer à travers ses portes en débris, et le déshonneur menacer sa fille, d'un seul coup il l'étendit morte à ses pieds, d'un autre il se perça le cœur et mourut à ses côtés.
>
> LE ROI. Belle Evadné, je chargerai votre frère de vous reprocher vos lenteurs. Quels étranges caprices !
>
> EVADNÉ. Je n'exigerai pas que votre impatience s'occupe de ces nombreux héros[1]. Ce sont eux qui combattirent en Palestine, et versèrent leur sang pour reconquérir le Saint Sépulcre. Ils firent deux serments : l'un de défendre la cause de leur Dieu, l'autre d'employer leurs bras à préserver la chasteté de toute femme outragée.
>
> LE ROI. Belle Evadné, je ne pourrais pousser plus loin la complaisance, sans encourir vos dédains par ma froideur. Je vous en conjure, fille adorable, mettez un terme à cette déraisonnable fantaisie.

---

[1] La même prétérition se trouve dans *Hernani*. On raconte que Hugo dut faire des coupures dans cette scène à la représentation. Il n'est pas certain que cette prétérition signale les coupures faites, puisqu'elle est déjà dans *Evadné*.

Evadné. Sire, il n'en reste plus qu'un, et quand vous l'aurez examiné et satisfait ainsi mon désir, vous me trouverez soumise aux vôtres : regardez, Sire, connaissez-vous cette statue ?

Le Roi. En vérité, je ne la connais pas.

Evadné. Eh bien, examinez encore ; car je n'aurais pas bonne opinion de la mémoire des princes, si vous ne vous rappelez rien qui ait ressemblé à cette image. Considérez ce sourire, Sire, considérez-le bien.

Le Roi. C'est votre père !

Evadné (*d'un accent de triomphe*). Oh ! oui, c'est bien mon père ! Cette âme sublime, généreuse et presque divine, dont la mémoire, eût-il laissé sa fille sans asile et sans appui dans le monde, serait un héritage dont une princesse pourrait s'enorgueillir ! Mon père, que nul après lui n'égala en honneur, en vertu, en pure intégrité ! Voilà bien ce sourire qui comme la lumière d'un beau jour réfléchit tout autour de lui la beauté de son âme. Sire, que fut mon père ?

Le Roi. Un homme, je me plais à le dire, de hautes et nombreuses vertus.

Evadné. Quoi ! rien de plus ? Je vais aider votre mémoire. Lorsque le dernier roi de Naples cherchait, parmi les plus nobles de son royaume, un homme vertueux auquel il pût confier votre adolescence, ce fut lui qui en fut trouvé le plus digne. Bien jeune encore que vous étiez, il vous plaça dans l'aire de cet aigle : sous son aile vous apprîtes à vous élancer à la gloire. Mon père vous prodigua ses soins précieux, et il fut un temps où l'on put vous croire reconnaissant de ces soins. Sa vie entière vous fut consacrée, et sa mort.... Ah ! Sire ! qui vous fait tressaillir ? Il combattait à vos côtés dans les plaines du Milanais ; il vit une épée menacer votre poitrine, s'élança, reçut le coup, et tomba à vos pieds. Me trompe-je, Seigneur ? Ne mourut-il pas pour sauver votre vie ? (*Elle s'élance vers la statue*) Image glacée ! Quoique ce sein ne renferme pas un cœur animé, et que le sang ne circule pas dans ces veines, laisse-moi te serrer dans mes bras et te presser contre ma poitrine. Maintenant, Sire, je suis prête. Venez détacher ces faibles bras et m'arracher de ce marbre sans vie. Accordez aux services de mon père le prix que savent donner les princes, en me ravissant l'innocence et en me couvrant d'un opprobre éternel.

Le Roi. Elle a fait entrer le remords dans mon âme !

Evadné. Approchez, Seigneur ! Venez au milieu de mes ancêtres m'arracher des bras de mon père ! Venez, si vous l'osez, et que le déshonneur de sa fille le récompense du sang qu'il a versé jusqu'à la dernière goutte pour sauver la vie de son prince ! Je vous attends.... [Acte v, Scène iv.]

Voilà ce que V. Hugo a lu dans la *Revue Trimestrielle.* Son emprunt ne fait pas doute, non plus que son infériorité. Il a pris, de la scène anglaise, l'idée, le mouvement général, l'insistance de don Ruy Gomez sur son père, l'exaltation d'honneur et de gloire ; mais, quoi qu'en dise le rédacteur du *National*, il a transposé tout le détail, pour adapter à don Ruy, homme, noble, vieux, et espagnol, les remontrances d'Evadné à son roi.

L'idée de l'honneur féminin et du dévouement chevaleresque de ses ancêtres à cet honneur dominent Evadné ; celle de la grandeur guerrière et surtout celle de l'honneur du gentilhomme dominent don Ruy. Dans les deux cas, les circonstances déterminent trop nettement les pensées des personnages pour qu'une imitation étroite de Shiel par Hugo fût possible[1].

Cependant, ces deux inspirations analogues et différentes ont peut-être un point de contact dans le vers suivant de Hugo, réserve faite de ses sources particulières :

---

[1] Pour l'*hispanisation* de la scène, voir Rosières, *La genèse de Hernani* (Revue bleue, 1896). Cet article n'épuise pas la matière.

Il affranchit Léon du tribut des cent vierges.

Christoval sauvant don Sanche n'est pas sans rappeler non plus, sous la même réserve, le père d'Evadné mourant pour son roi.

Notons enfin que Hernani assiste, caché, à la scène d'intimidation ou de corruption de don Ruy par don Carlos, comme le frère d'Evadné à la scène de séduction de sa sœur. D'ailleurs il y assiste, comme on sait, sans l'entendre ni la voir, dans un repaire 'profond, si sourd et si perdu;' que les sons n'y parviennent pas[1].

Là ne s'arrête pas, probablement, la dette de Hugo. Il a peut-être transposé une partie de la scène de Shiel dans une autre scène de son drame, la 5^e^ de l'acte III. Les reproches d'ingratitude qu'Evadné adresse au Roi, don Ruy les jette plus amèrement encore à la face de Hernani, pour avoir payé son hospitalité d'une trahison.

Observons enfin que *Mirandola*, de Proctor, imitée du *Don Carlos* de Schiller, met en scène un duc, vieillard amoureux et jaloux, nouvellement marié à la jeune Isidora. La situation de barbon amoureux, usée en France, a pu paraître à Hugo rafraîchie, renouvelée par l'exemple de l'étranger. S'il en était ainsi, la *Revue Trimestrielle* aurait joué un rôle assez important dans la détermination de l'intrigue de Hernani.

Enfin, il n'y a qu'une lointaine et fugace ressemblance entre les résistances d'Evadné au Roi, et de Doña Sol à Don Carlos ou à Don Ruy.

Le journaliste du *National* avait-il tort ou raison de condamner si violemment les emprunts du Romantisme ? Il y a dans sa colère et dans son dégoût une part de vérité et de justesse. Il ne s'étonnait pas sans raison que le Romantisme continuât les errements de ces classiques dont il prétendait si bruyamment s'affranchir. Les modèles changeaient : les procédés d'invention et de composition demeuraient. C'était une contradiction qui pouvait choquer. Mais, vue de plus haut, elle attestait la continuité, à certains égards, de la tradition littéraire à travers les diverses écoles ; et de cette continuité, le journaliste de goût classique aurait pu triompher. Comme la plupart de ses contemporains, il a préféré la mauvaise humeur à l'ironie.

GUSTAVE RUDLER.

LONDRES.

---

[1] Voir *Victor Hugo raconté*, XIX.

NOTES ON THE SOURCES OF ANATOLE FRANCE.

Anatole France has a unique position among contemporary French writers. He is almost universally recognized as the greatest prose stylist in France and probably in the world. In consequence of this distinction considerable attention has been paid to the study of his sources. A number of articles dealing with the origins of one or another of his works have been published. The material thus accumulated has been summed up and largely augmented by M. Gustave Michaut in his valuable book: *Anatole France: Étude psychologique* (Paris, Fontemoing, [1913]). The following stray notes, the result of a recent perusal of a number of the works of the master, may be of some service as a supplement to M. Michaut's book.

M. Michaut has given particular attention (p. 119 ff.) to the instances in which Anatole France has used data derived not from literature but from reality. The following cases should probably find a place in his list. There occurs in the *Livre de mon ami* a character called 'le Père Le Beau,' who has a hobby for making catalogues and forms a collection of books and other things, including a model of the Bastille. It seems to me that the 'Père Le Beau' was drawn from the novelist's father. 'Le Père France[1]' published an important catalogue of Revolutionary literature[2], and gathered so many documents bearing on the period in question that his son says that he was in some sort 'l'archiviste de la Révolution française[3].' If this identification be correct, it gives us an important hint to add to the indications we already have of the influence of François-Noël Thibault upon his son[4], for Nozière says (p. 70) that it was the 'Père Le Beau' who gave him 'la folie des choses d'esprit et la manie d'écrire.' Be this as it may, there can be no doubt that France the bookseller is the 'garde du corps,' 'Leclerc jeune,' in *Pierre Nozière*. Here he is transformed into a dealer in armour. The fragment of the white flag of the Bourbons borne off after the abdication of Charles X by both Leclerc and France leaves no doubt as to the identification of the two old soldiers. Leclerc has a patron, M. de

---

[1] M. Victor Giraud (*Les Maîtres de l'heure*, II [Paris, 1914], p. 182) states that Anatole France's father was known by this name. As M. Casset points out (*Anatole France, Ses Origines angevines et son Oeuvre* [*Extrait de la Revue de l'Anjou;* Angers, 1915], p. 3), the name 'France' is a common Angevin abbreviation of the first name of François-Noël Thibault, the bookseller. The name would naturally pass on to his son, Anatole-François Thibault.

[2] The catalogue of the British Museum, s. v. Huchet de la Bédoyère, gives the title: 'Description historique et bibliographique de la collection de...M. le Comte H. de la Bédoyère, sur la Révolution française, l'Empire et la Restauration, rédigée par France. Paris, 1862.'

[3] *Le bibliophile français* (March, 1870), p. 262, cited by Giraud, *op. cit.*, p. 183, n. 3.

[4] Cf. Giraud, pp. 182–3.

Gerboise, who is clearly the Count de la Bédoyère[1]. A third instance of Anatole France's use of his personal recollections may be added to M. Michaut's list. In connection with a remark of M. Doumic's that M. France frequently describes scenes suggested by pictures, a tendency which M. Michaut connects interestingly enough (p. 180) with his mother's habit of telling stories about pictures, M. Michaut sets forth in detail[2] a number of cases in which various characters are compared incidentally with individual paintings or sculptures. Thus we are told that in the *Mannequin d'osier* the cobbler, Piédagnel, with his 'menton saillant,' is compared with the stone figures of a church portal. It would have been more to the point to note that Piédagnel is a reflection of Anatole France's old teacher, the Abbé Lalanne, who likewise had an 'énorme menton' and resembled sculptured saints[3].

In connection with M. France's use of written sources, it may be of interest to point out that the blow given by M. d'Astarac to Jacques Tournebroche[4] is an echo of the famous story in the memoirs of Benvenuto Cellini. There has been some discussion as to the hint which led Anatole France to read the *Comte de Gabalis* of the Abbé de Villars, the chief source of the *Rôtisserie*[5]. The *Victoire du mari* (1889) of the Rosicrucian Joséphin Péladan, which Anatole France certainly read some years before the appearance of the *Rôtisserie* (1893)[6], contains a considerable number of references to sylphs and salamanders. Is it possible that this was the book which stimulated M. France to hunt up the *Comte de Gabalis*, the *locus classicus* for the kind of mystic zoology in question[7]? D. S. BLONDHEIM.

BALTIMORE, MD.

---

[1] Cf. the passage from the *Bibliophile français* just cited; M. Giraud fails to note its bearing on the *Livre de mon ami* and on *Pierre Nozière*.

[2] Pp. 170, 172, 184.

[3] Cf. the passage cited from the *Temps* of August 6, 1886, by M. Giraud (p. 186, n. 1), who makes no reference to the *Mannequin*.

[4] *Rôtisserie de la reine Pédauque*, p. 49.

[5] M. Jean Emile Morel (*Grande revue*, LXX (1911), p. 246 ff.), thinks that the 1871 edition of the *Diable amoureux* of J. Cazotte was France's starting point; M. Michaut accepts (p. 162) M. Morel's rather dubious demonstration that M. France knew this edition. M. Léon Carias (*Grande revue*, LXXVI (1912), p. 732, n. 1) believes M. France learned of Villars through an article in Bayle.

[6] Cf. *Vie littéraire*, III, pp. 233–242.

[7] Is it worth while to point out that M. Morel is probably in error (*l. l.*, p. 232) in thinking that Anatole France took the series of names of God in the *Rôtisserie* (p. 59) from a chart in the *Comte de Gabalis*? The spelling of two of the three names found in the *Comte de Gabalis* (Adonaï, Tetragrammaton, Jehovah), is different, and the last three (Otheos, Athanatos, Schyros) are missing. M. Morel suggests that Anatole France invented the last three (Morel says erroneously two); this notion is most improbable. Schyros, which M. Morel leaves unexplained, is *ἰσχυρός*, 'mighty,' which is generally used to render the Hebrew *El*, 'God,' in Aquila's Greek version of the Old Testament. (Cf. Reider, *Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew...Index to Aquila* (Philadelphia, 1916), p. 30). M. France is too good a Hellenist to commit such a blunder on his own account. Moreover, Otheos (ὁ θεός), is apparently a translation of Adonaï, and Athanatos of the Tetragrammaton.

THE DIALECT OF 'GORMONT AND ISEMBART.'

Sostmann[1] to whom we owe the latest careful survey of the language of the fragment *Gormont and Isembart* inclined to the theory that absence of dialectal traits in the language indicated the *francien* origin of the poet, and M. Bayot, the latest editor, subscribes to his opinion[2]. '*Si l'on élimine l'ensemble des formes et graphies qui lui* (*the scribe*) *sont imputables,...il reste un texte que ne caractérise aucun trait dialectal notoire. Selon toute apparence, le poème a été rédigé dans la langue littéraire de la France centrale*[2].'

In his demonstration of the absence of Picardism in the poet's language Sostmann is undoubtedly on sure ground, but it appears to me that neither he nor M. Bayot has given weight enough to certain linguistic traits, indubitably provincial, that connect the poet[3] with the region lying to the South-West of Paris and the Ile de France.

For the sake of clearness of presentment I will resume shortly the chief linguistic characteristics of the fragment.

A. *Phonetic.*

(1) Equivalence of ẽ and ã (*laisses* II, IV).

(2) Avoidance of the use of words containing the product of the group ε + *jod* (e.g. *piz, diz, pire*) in *i* assonances, i.e. the use of a dialectal pronunciation of this group. With the exception of the title-word, *sire*, this avoidance is complete, and it should be remembered that the type of assonance is well represented in the poem, there being four *laisses* in *i* (*i—e*), containing in all 124 lines.

(3) Use of the words derived from **mansionata* and **ficata* in an *e—e* assonance (XV).

(4) Inclusion of words with the older diphthong *ai* in an ε assonance, cf. *traite* in *laisse* III and *faire* in *laisse* IX.

B. *Morphological.*

(1) Use of the stressed nominative *gie* in the *ie* assonance (*laisse* XVI).

(2) Use of the uncompounded form *ist*: l. 274 *par is*[*t*] *campon.*

---

[1] C. Sostmann, *Der Formenbau des Nomens und Verbums in dem Fragment vom Gormont et Isembart*, Kiel, 1910.

[2] *Gormont et Isembart*, édité par Alphonse Bayot, Paris, 1914. (Les Classiques Français du Moyen Age.)

[3] The poet and not the poem, for the stuff of the poem is clearly local Picard, cf. Bedier in his study of the poem in *Les Légendes Epiques*, vol. IV.

(3) Survival of the pluperfect indicative: *devret* l. 633 with conditional force:

> *Que ja dira li frans gentilz. Par quei il devret bien guarir.*

(4) Frequent use of the *ie* perfect type (*laisses* XI and XII).

C. *Syntactical.*

(1) Weakening of the declension system—cf. use of *suer, emperere* and *icil* as accusatives in ll. 328, 493, 649 respectively.

(2) Use of the unstressed pronoun object with a prepositional infinitive: *pur l'eshalcier*, l. 380.

Of these traits the two first are the most important, and if we could be equally sure of both, their coincidence in one poem would enable us to locate it at once within comparatively narrow limits. The extension of the two traits has been traced by Suchier in the valuable maps that accompany his article in the *Grundriss der Romanischen Philologie.* According to these maps the use of the first trait—the lowering of *ẽ* and *ã*—excludes the greater part of the West, i.e. Normandy, Maine, Anjou and Touraine, while the occurrence of the second, the dialectal pronunciation of the product of ɛ + *jod*, excludes the whole of the Isle de France and the West and South-West districts immediately adjacent to it. The combination of the two in one poem therefore seems to point to a rather narrow belt of country lying between Chartres and Etampes in the North, Blois and Orléans further South; a district, in other words, comprising the Eastern side of the Comitatus Blesensis and the extreme Western side of the royal domain according to the eleventh century territorial divisions[1], part of Perche and the Orléanais according to later mediaeval maps[2].

It is however obviously unsafe to build too much upon negative traits—on the absence of certain types of words in given assonances—so that it is essential to find corroboration of this localisation in the other linguistic traits. This is abundantly present. The whole set of characteristics enumerated above find their best parallels in the texts known to be composed in the district lying to the South-West of Paris. The morphological and syntactical traits offer perhaps the clearest evidence

The slackening of the rules of declension is first observable in the South-West dialects[3], and the use of the unstressed pronoun object with a prepositional infinitive is located by Rydberg in the district extending from Chartres and its neighbourhood to Northern Poitou[1].

---

[1] Cf. Northern France in 1066 in Poole's *Historical Atlas*.

[2] Cf. Suchier's maps.

[3] Cf. my *Etude sur la Langue de Frère Angier*, pp. 58, 59. The texts quoted there are all considerably later, but cf. the use of *soer* in *Roland* in l. 312 and that of *emperere* in l. 1444.

The only example in the twelfth century of the use of a pluperfect indicative similar to the *devret* quoted above is that of *dure* in the *Roman de Thebes* 8537 (*Tel rien fiz que faire nen dure*); the examples of the use of the uncompounded forms of *iste* in the twelfth century all occur in texts of the south-western district (*Thebes*, *Troie*, *Horn*, *Angier*). According to the dissertation of Woltersdorff[2] it is in the West and South-West that the *ie* perfects are most frequent[3], and it is in this same region also that the equivalence of *e* and *ie* (from *a* preceded by a palatal) first makes its appearance[4].

The localisation of the poet's language in the district defined above to the South-West of Paris seems to me therefore very clearly authorised by the language. Certain traits—the use of *devret* and *ist*, of analogical forms in the declension, the beginnings of the equivalence of *ie* with *e*—may indicate the more southern part of it.

Further corroboration of this localisation is seen perhaps also in the poet's description of one of the minor personages engaged in the battle. Of these, it will be remembered, only two are described with some detail:

Li quens de Normandie, *Icil qui de Ruem fut sire Et de Fescamp fist l'abbeïe* (ll. 140–143) and still more particularly: *Eodon le Champaneis, Celui qui tint Chartres e Bleis, Chastel Landon en Gastineis* (ll. 87–89), and who further in l. 103 is supposed to have some connection with Estampes (*Vos fussiez miels en Estampeis*). The prototype of this personage is evidently Eudes II de Chartres, d. 1037[5]. It is true that the poet blunders in his delimitation of Eodon's fief, for M. Lot[6] points out that the *Gastineis* never belonged either to Eudes himself or his family, but the particularity of the description, the geographical knowledge it displays, and the desire to magnify the possessions of the House of Blois may well afford a clue to our poet's interest and indicate that his birth-place should be sought not in the extreme West of the royal domain but in the Comitatus Blesensis.

---

[1] Rydberg, *Geschichte des französischen* ə, I, p. 380.

[2] H. Woltersdorff, *Das Perfektum der 2. schwachen Konjugation im Altfranzösischen*, 1882.

[3] The form *gie* might be used to exclude Picard or Wallon dialects but not to differentiate between francien and S.W. texts. Cf. Rydberg II, §§ 121, 122.

[4] Cf. *Etude sur Frère Angier*, p. 57. I incline to think also that the levelling of *ai to* ɛ began first in this region also, but the material I have collected so far only affords presumption not sure proof.

[5] Cf. M. Lot's article on *Gormond et Isembard* in *Romania* XXVII, p. 51.

[6] pp. 53–54.

In conclusion I will briefly call attention to a point of some interest that arises out of the study of the dialect.

The similarity between some of the linguistic traits enumerated above and those that characterise the language of the *Chanson de Roland* must have been borne in on the mind of every student of the language of that poem. They afford strong corroboration of the theory put forward some years ago by Baist[1]. On the strength of the first two characteristics that we have considered, Baist located the *Roland* in the district lying round Chartres and Châteaudun ('in den Landschaften von Chartres und dem Dunois'), i.e. in the same belt of country in which we have found reason to place the *Gormont and Isembart* poet, though probably rather more to the North. It is surely not without significance that the authors of two of the three oldest *Chansons de Geste* should apparently come forth from so very much the same region.

M. K. POPE.

OXFORD.

---

[1] G. Baist, *Variationen über Roland* 2074, 2176. (Foerster Festgabe 213–32.)

REVIEWS.

Social Life in Britain from the Conquest to the Reformation. Compiled by G. G. COULTON. Cambridge: University Press, 1918. 8vo. xvi + 540 pp.

Students of the life and thought of the middle ages who have derived benefit from the rich and varied treasury collected by Mr Coulton in *A Medieval Garner* will welcome his new and equally valuable anthology. The method of the earlier volume, in which series of extracts from single authors were arranged consecutively without regard to their subjects, has been exchanged for a more systematic classification, in which the passages are grouped to illustrate fifteen different aspects of medieval life. From the historical point of view, this is a distinct advantage. Each extract, however, is so complete in itself and is translated, where translation into modern English is necessary, with such accuracy and, at the same time, with such insight into the writer's mind and imaginative appreciation of his circumstances, that the work has a literary value quite apart from the utilitarian merits of the ordinary historical source-book. It would be difficult to point to a more complete illustration of the essential unity of literary and historical studies. While the primary bearing of its contents is upon the civilisation and culture of the epoch, Mr Coulton does not emphasise their importance in this respect to the exclusion of other considerations; and his methods of selection and presentation imply an artistic sense in complete harmony with his consciousness of his duties as an historian.

Although the book is concerned with medieval Britain, the literature of other countries has been drawn upon where it throws light upon the life and manners of Englishmen. The childhood and youth of a poet and his early love-romance 'in the jolly month of May,' illustrated by selections from Froissart's *Espinette Amoureuse*, are peculiar to no single age or country. The missionary activity of the first friars is represented, not only by a passage translated from Eccleston, but by excerpts from the memoirs of the Italian Jordan of Giano, one of the members of the mission sent by St Francis to Germany in 1221. For the methods of the masons who were responsible for the building of our great medieval churches, Mr Coulton has naturally gone to the famous sketch-book of the Picard Villard de Honnecourt, translating some of the more interesting notes with which the master-mason supplemented his drawings and reproducing three of the drawings themselves. The community of custom between England and the rest of Europe is thus clearly indicated where necessary, and the part of England in the great European movements of the middle ages is shown in its due proportion.

The larger portion of the text consists of translations from Latin and other languages; but a considerable amount of English poetry and prose is given, including extracts from medieval English translations, such as Trevisa's versions of Higden and Bartholomaeus Anglicus. For Froissart's historical works Mr Coulton has used Berners' version, and for certain ecclesiastical documents his source has been Foxe's *Acts and Monuments.* Obsolete and unfamiliar words are explained in brief notes, which give their meaning without further comment to distract the reader's attention from the main subject. Many passages, whether in the original English or in their translated form, will already be familiar to students of the period. *Piers Plowman*, for example, is represented by several passages, and the autobiographic selections from Ordericus Vitalis and Giraldus Cambrensis are no novelty. It is Mr Coulton's merit, however, that by his skilful arrangement of his material, aided by prefatory notes of an admirable clearness and conciseness, he relieves points in such passages which may well escape proper attention when they are read merely as incidental portions of a connected work. Such relief is the principal object of an anthology of this kind, and Mr Coulton's success in producing the desired effect is a model and an encouragement to other compilers. But, side by side with the more famous passages of his book, he sets many which are not so easily accessible or which are entirely new. We may mention in particular the anecdotes taken from MS. Lambeth 51 *b*, *Petrus Londoniensis de Visionibus*, in which Peter, prior of Holy Trinity, Aldgate (1197–1221), collected a vast series of stories of supernatural revelations to convince those who 'consider only what they see, believing neither in good nor in evil angels, nor in life after death, nor in any other spiritual and invisible things.' Peter introduced into his miscellany incidents which had come under his own notice; and the examples chosen by Mr Coulton, like the miracle-stories related by Bede, are set against a background drawn with a natural and effective realism.

From Mr Coulton's prefatory notes, which are packed with useful information, and from his occasional foot-notes the student will learn much. Froissart's 'fair sweet lady,' reading a romance in a garden one May morning at the hour of prime, closes her mouth at the coming of her lover (p. 86). 'It is only with the advent of the printed book,' remarks Mr Coulton, 'that reading has become a silent occupation. Philip heard the eunuch reading to himself, yet aloud; St Augustine discusses at great length the probable reasons why St Ambrose was so eccentric as to read silently.' The countess of Clare in 1324 engaged a writer to make a copy of *Vitae Patrum* at Clare castle, paying him eight shillings for sixteen weeks' work (p. 102). From the number of words in *Vitae Patrum* Mr Coulton deduces the amount of the scribe's daily work and the fact that his rate of payment was equivalent to that of the ordinary artisan. The angry reproaches addressed to St Stephen, the patron saint of Launceston priory, by Ailsi, the clerk of the works of the church-tower, who was obliged to retire from his occupation owing to an affection in one of his eyes (p. 222), give occasion for a note on 'the medieval habit of making the Saint responsible for prayers unfulfilled.' To his examples Mr Coulton might have added the fact that the habit is by no means extinct in certain parts of Europe. Witnesses of the miracle of the liquefaction of the blood of San Gennaro at Naples testify to the threats with which the impatient crowd assails the saint in cases of delay: as the *curé* of a famous pilgrimage-church in the south of France, describing a somewhat similar scene, observed to the present writer, *On est dans le Midi ; on crie ; on acclame.* Mr Coulton's studies in the popular inscriptions scratched on the walls and piers of churches in Cambridgeshire and the neighbouring counties supply interesting notes on pp. 173 and 498.

Such errors of fact as occur in the notes are so slight that it is unnecessary to comment upon them in detail. The description of a cote-hardie on p. 149 as 'a close packet' appears to be a misprint for 'a close jacket.' We notice on p. 210 that too much confidence is given to Fuller's insinuation that the controversy between Peckham and Wickwane in 1280 was the 'last flash' of the quarrel for precedence between the archbishops of Canterbury and York. Fuller, in fact, calls it merely 'the last flash which I find of this flame.' The dispute continued for many years after and remained unsettled until 1353, and its final details, with the composition arranged between Islip and Thoresby which is the base of the existing relations between the primates, may be studied in documents printed in Rymer's *Foedera*, Wharton's *Anglia Sacra* and Wilkins' *Concilia.*

The important statement on p. 187 that 'the whole Middle Ages may be looked upon as a long period of suffering and convalescence from the barbarian invasions, which influenced European thought down to and beyond the Reformation' is the key to Mr Coulton's attitude towards his chosen period. His sympathies have been trenchantly declared in his previous books and pamphlets: to apply the quotation with which he heads two extracts from *Piers Plowman*, they are with those who 'stretch lame hands of faith and grope' towards the fuller light of a later day. The romantic view of the middle ages entertained by sentimentalists is a target against which he steadily directs his bullets; and its eminent defender, Cardinal Gasquet, now as on other occasions, comes more than once within his line of fire. Lovers of medieval art, fascinated by its beauty and its appeal to emotion and the religious sense, are constantly tempted to neglect or to make too little of historical evidence which it is hard to reconcile with a theory of artistic effort prompted by a simple and absorbing faith. Mr Coulton, second to none in his appreciation of medieval art and its spiritual suggestiveness, has made it his mission to put us on our guard against this danger, to demonstrate the religious and social problems which were the substance of medieval thought and to set in relief the spirit of questioning and revolt against established privilege which was active then as now. He presents us with a picture in which the squalor of medieval life is not obscured by the pageant of its beauty and colour, in which also faith is hard pressed by doubt and discontent. In his anxiety to dispel popular illusions, it is not unnatural that, while, as in a note on p. 237, he does his best endeavour to be impartial, he should occasionally lay too much stress on the darker side of the contrast. We cannot agree, for instance, that the preamble of Peckham's constitution upon religious instruction by parish priests, if taken on its own merits, involves so serious a condemnation of clerical ignorance as he implies (pp. 264–5), or that its addition contradicts the modern apologists who have omitted, not necessarily for partisan reasons, to quote it. If the pastoral care of parish clergy was insufficient and the hungry sheep call for our sympathy more than the blind mouths which denied or scantily satisfied their wants, more justice might be done to the pastoral care exercised, even in the later middle ages, by bishops. The bishop of Norwich before whom the Lollard woman whose heresies are recounted on pp. 462–5 was summoned was a model of duty to the clergy of his day, and the fine remark in his will upon those of his contemporaries to whom money meant more than the welfare of their dioceses, '*quorum perversitates negligere perturbare nil est aliud quam fovere*,' deserves to be better known than it is. Every allowance should be made for such prelates in their dealings with Lollards, as the abundant testimony of episcopal registers shows; and the most conspicuous example of all, the official account of Arundel's examination of Oldcastle, which would not be out of place in a work of this kind, reveals some considerable patience and self-restraint on the part of the archbishop—qualities with which, as the passages on pp. 209–10 and 211–2 show, archbishops sometimes dispensed. We refer especially to ecclesiastical matters, because it is upon the medieval churchman that Mr Coulton's selections reflect most severely. We have no wish that his faults or the abuses of the system of which he was a servant should be concealed: they were surprisingly numerous and wide-spread, as every candid student recognises. But we are ready to believe that such clergy as Chaucer's parson or St Gilbert of Sempringham (see pp. 213–4, 232–6) were more common than historical records indicate; and the student should keep in mind the fact that the official documents which supply the heaviest weight of condemnation are judicial records which, in the nature of things, are not concerned with the advertisement of obscure virtue.

> *Les bons et vrais dévots, qu'on doit suivre à la trace,*
> *Ne sont pas ceux aussi qui font tant de grimace;*

and we are sure that, if Mr Coulton is apt to look somewhat sternly upon medieval religion and its professors, and if Erasmus would have found him a sympathetic companion at Walsingham (pp. 251–8), his criticisms are directed less against the spirit of an age with which he has so much sympathy than against the type of historian who, in the face of clear fact, willingly adopts the unenlightened attitude of Orgon to the vices of Tartuffe.

We hope that the demand for this volume will lead to the issue of a less expensive edition. The only drawback at present to its popularity as a classical handbook of reference is a price which puts it above the means of those who need it most.

A. HAMILTON THOMPSON.

GRETTON, NEAR KETTERING.

A Bibliography of Thomas Gray. By CLARK SUTHERLAND NORTHUP. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1917. 8vo. xiii + 296 pp.

In a letter to Horace Walpole written from Cambridge on Feb. 25, 1768, in answer to an enquiry as to a new edition of his *Poems* (which was published by Dodsley in July of that year) Gray explains that the *Long Story* was to be omitted, and that 'to supply the place of it in bulk, lest *my works* should be mistaken for the works of a flea, or a pismire[1]' he had undertaken to send the publisher 'an equal weight of poetry or prose,' amounting to 'about two ounces of stuff'—'and with all this,' he adds, 'I shall be but a shrimp of an author.' In view of this slender bulk of Gray's literary output it was with no little surprise that we found Professor Northup's *Bibliography* to consist of an 8vo volume of more than three hundred pages, in which the separate items described exceed two thousand. The explanation is to be found in the fact that the author's scheme aimed at the compilation not only of a complete record of the editions of Gray's works, but also of a list of all the reviews, critical notices, and studies relating to him that had appeared down to the beginning of 1917, the year of publication. That any single individual should achieve finality in the execution of such a comprehensive scheme is hardly to be expected; but Professor Northup may fairly claim to have registered everything of real importance. The *Elegy* alone accounts for about 650 items, comprising some 250 editions; more than 130 translations into fifteen different languages, including Armenian, Bohemian, Hebrew, Hungarian, Russian, and Japanese; and upwards of 150 parodies and imitations. The earliest parody (by John Duncombe) appeared in 1753, two years after the first publication of the poem, and oddly enough it was published by the same publisher (Dodsley), in the same format, and at the same price (6*d.*) as the original. Among the parodies are elegies 'on a quid of tobacco' (1799), 'on a pair of breeches thrown upon a dunghill by a miser' (1818), 'on an old pipe-box' (1874), and 'on a favourite washerwoman' (1882). Of the translations the largest number (over forty) are in Latin; French comes second, with close on forty; and Italian third, with a couple of dozen. Latin was first in the field (1762), with a composite rendering into elegiacs, published at Cambridge, by Christopher Anstey, the author four years later of the famous *New Bath Guide*, and W. H. Roberts, Fellow of King's. French came next, headed by the version (1765) of Madame Necker, the heroine, as Susanne Curchod, of Gibbon's early romance, who had renewed relations with her in Paris in that very year. The earliest Italian translation did not appear until 1772, the year after Gray's death. Anstey's version brought him an interesting letter from Gray, which is not included in the collected editions of Gosse or of Tovey, but is duly registered by Professor Northup, in another section of his volume, as having been printed in the introduction to the 1808 edition of Anstey's works—a characteristic instance of Professor Northup's thoroughness, which may serve to indicate, not only the care with which the work has been compiled, but also the general utility and interest of this *Bibliography* to the student of Gray.

---

[1] Curiously enough the *New English Dictionary* has no eighteenth century instance of this word in its ordinary sense as here used by Gray.

We have noticed an occasional slip or misprint; e.g. 'reprinted' for 'reproduced,' in No. 687; 'Italian' for 'Latin,' in No. 820; 'ara' for 'aera,' in No. 848; 'linci' for 'lirici,' in No. 1491; and 'Asheton' for 'Ashton,' on p. 250. Among minor omissions[1] may be mentioned FitzThomas's vindication of Gray from the strictures of Dr Johnson, which is referred to by Miss Anna Seward in her letter to FitzThomas of July 9, 1788; and several letters by the present writer to *The Times*, the indexes of which do not seem to have been methodically laid under contribution. In the interests of completeness the references to the latter may be given here, viz., 'Original MSS. of Gray's Elegy' (Dec. 12, 1913); 'Gray and Walpole: the Pseudonym Celadon' (March 9, 1914); 'Gray and Walpole: an Unfounded Inference' (March 23, 1914); 'Horace Walpole and Mrs G.' (April 13, 1914); and 'A Misprint in Gray' (April 22, 1915). The statement, reproduced (under No. 1533) from Dibdin's *Bibliomania*, that six copies only of Garrick's lines to Gray on his Odes were printed at Strawberry Hill, might have been corrected in the light of the reference (duly given by Professor Northup) to the question in *The Correspondence of Gray, Walpole, West and Ashton* (vol. II, pp. 174–5), where it is pointed out, on the authority of Horace Walpole's own (as yet unpublished) MS. *Journal of the Printing-Office at Strawberry Hill*, that the number of copies printed was not six only, but at least sixty. With regard to another statement, reproduced (under No. 2002) from the introduction to the third volume of Tovey's *Letters of Thomas Gray* (but without the reference), to the effect that 'an early correspondence of Gray's which is said to throw light upon his difference with Walpole' was at one time in the possession of Messrs Quaritch, it may be mentioned here that the present writer was informed recently by Messrs Quaritch that this statement appears to have been made under a misapprehension.

Professor Northup makes an interesting correction (under No. 473) with regard to Gray's translation of the Ugolino episode from *Inferno* XXXIII, which Mr Gosse claims to have printed for the first time in his *Works of Thomas Gray* in 1884 (see vol. I, pp. xvi, 157), but which the *Bibliography* records to have been printed in part as long before as 1849 in the *Gentleman's Magazine*. The volume, which is admirably planned and arranged, and is provided with a useful (though by no means exhaustive) index, is inscribed in a graceful dedication to the President of Magdalen, whose 'studia in Graium poetam impensa' are well known to every student and lover of Gray.

---

[1] Since this review was written a Canadian correspondent has pointed out in *The Times Literary Supplement* for April 18 that Mr Northup has failed to record several Spanish translations of the *Elegy*.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.

Bibliography of Johnson. By WILLIAM PRIDEAUX COURTNEY. Revised and seen through the Press by DAVID NICHOL SMITH. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1915. 8vo. viii + 186 pp.

Mr W. P. Courtney's *Bibliography of Samuel Johnson*, which forms a volume in the series of *Oxford Historical and Literary Studies* issued under the direction of Professors Firth and Sir Walter Raleigh, is a posthumous publication, the MS. having been sent to press only a few weeks before the author's death. The proofs have been read, and the work revised, and where desirable supplemented, by Mr D. Nichol Smith, himself a Johnsonian of repute. The title of the work is something of a misnomer, and hardly does justice to the contents; for though the object of the book, as stated in the preface, is to give a record of the publication of Johnson's writings and compositions, it is apparent at a glance that it is a good deal more than a mere list of editions, the bibliography being so treated as to present the main facts of Johnson's literary career in the form of a series of interesting *causeries*, in which is incorporated not only matter that has hitherto been more or less inaccessible, but also much that is new. The article on *The Rambler*, for instance, runs to ten pages, of which not more than two or three are bibliographical in the strict sense of the word; that on the *Lives of the Poets* runs to more than twenty; and the article, of great interest, on *The Dictionary* exceeds thirty pages. *A propos* of *The Rambler* Mr Courtney records how Ruskin's father used to take with him on his foreign journeys 'four little volumes of Johnson—*The Idler* and *The Rambler*'—as containing 'more substantial literary nourishment than could be, from any other author, packed into so portable compass'; anyhow the volumes were read and re-read in spare hours and on wet days, until, as Ruskin confesses in *Praeterita*, he became impregnated with their style, which dominated him for some years. In the *causerie* on the *Dictionary* it is related of Browning that, when he had decided to adopt literature as a profession, he qualified himself for it 'by reading and digesting the whole of Johnson's Dictionary'—a performance which suggests a query as to what Johnson, who would not even admit such a word as 'civilization' into his *Dictionary*, would have thought of some of Browning's verbal coinages. In connection with Lauder's fraudulent attempts to convict Milton of plagiarism, Mr Courtney mentions a curious instance of Johnson's inconsistency; namely, that in spite of his avowed detestation of Milton's political principles, and of his 'infamous and false attack on his fame and character' in the *Lives of the Poets*—treatment which goaded the mild Cowper into exclaiming: 'Oh! I could thresh his old jacket till I made his pension jingle in his pocket!'—he yet carefully preserved a lock of Milton's hair, a lock which had once belonged to Addison, and which subsequently passed into the possession of Leigh Hunt, by whom it was given to Browning.

A particularly valuable and interesting feature of Mr Courtney's notes is the information given as to the present whereabouts of notable copies of Johnson's works. Thus we learn that Burke's copy of the *Dictionary*, with MS. notes, is in the British Museum; that Johnson's corrected copy of the fourth edition (1773) of the same work, once the property of Sir Joshua Reynolds, passed into the library of Lord Spencer at Althorp, and thence with the rest of his collection to the John Rylands Library at Manchester; that Malone's copy of the Dublin 1775 edition, with MS. memoranda, and more than a thousand MS. remarks and observations, is in the British Museum; that the Bodleian possesses a copy of Williams's *Longitude at Sea* (written by Johnson), presented by Johnson, with MS. notes by him; that a special reprint of three articles contributed by Sir Joshua Reynolds to the *Idler*, presented to the writer by Johnson, and subsequently by Reynolds to Malone, passed at the death of its late owner, Mr C. E. Doble, into the hands of the editor of this *Bibliography*; that Pembroke College, Oxford, possesses a presentation copy from its former alumnus of his *Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland*, as well as Johnson's presentation copy to Sir Joshua Reynolds of his *Political Tracts* (1776), and the original MS. of his *Prayers and Meditations*; and so on. Unfortunately the index, which appears to be confined to the strictly bibliographical portions of the work, affords no clue to the whereabouts in the volume of this information, some of which is of the highest interest and importance from the point of view of the Johnsonian. It should be noted in conclusion that Professor Bensly's name is misspelt on page 48; and that the author of *London Lyrics*, whose great-grandfather communicated to Johnson a collection of examples from Tillotson made by Addison with a view to the compilation of an English Dictionary, did not take the name of 'Locker-Sampson' (p. 134).

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.

The Supernatural in Modern English Fiction. By DOROTHY SCARBOROUGH. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. The Knickerbocker Press. 1917. 8vo. vii + 329 pp.

There are few, none perhaps save the extremest Sadducee and sceptic, who will deny that the supernatural and the macabre form one of the most fascinating realms of fiction. The appeal is universal, and Lafcadio Hearn went so far as to say that 'there is scarcely any great author in European literature, old or new, who has not distinguished himself in his treatment of the supernatural.' Nor is there any exaggeration in his words. We are nothing surprised then to find Miss Scarborough at the very outset emphasizing the difficulties of her task owing to the enormous mass of material with which she was bound to deal. She very aptly opens her study with a chapter on 'The Gothic Romance,' and here takes occasion to observe that 'the terror novel proper is generally conceded to begin with [Horace Walpole's] Romantic curiosity *The Castle of Otranto*.' Walpole's pinchbeck mediaevalism has doubtless come to be an acknowledged landmark of literary history, and it serves this purpose conveniently enough, but none the less it is to be wished that Leland's *Longsword, Earl of Salisbury*, 'a romance of feudal times,' which preceded *Otranto* by two years, were not so entirely forgotten. Even Miss Scarborough has no mention of the earlier book, which in her pages assuredly deserves some recognition, however slight. It is obvious that although the supernatural—the word is used in its broadest sense—as expressed and treated in modern English fiction is the main theme of this study, it was necessary for the writer to trace in some measure the 'terror and blood' which had such vogue in our drama, and hence so marked an influence on the development of the novel. Nor can the tradition of the macabre, as it appears in Latin and Greek classics and in modern literatures other than our own, be wholly ignored, and as link is added to link a stupendous library has to be consulted, an almost incalculable number of volumes examined, for description and citation. Miss Scarborough promises a bibliography which is to comprise over three thousand titles, and which cannot fail to be of permanent value and importance. She has already brought together such an accumulated quantity of material and in this present study discussed so many romances, short stories, chapters, and even episodes that with her copious and painstaking industry it is all the more surprising to note the omission of works which surely rank among the masterpieces of modern macabre fiction. Thus she does not refer to the series of ghost stories from the erudite pen of the Provost of King's, two volumes which have pages so vivid in their description of malignant entities and sinister intelligences, that, when the first tale, *Canon Alberic's Scrap-Book*, appeared some years ago in *The National Review*, people were asking if it were not really true, and it was with something like relief we learned that Dr James had invented his midnight demon of the pit. Dr James is of great importance in a study of the supernatural in fiction, and this not only because his stories are consummate masterpieces, but because in his preface to *More Ghost Stories of an Antiquary* he gives us his ideas 'how a ghost story ought to be laid out if it is to be effective,' and very striking and suggestive these ideas are. He has moreover initiated a certain school of ghost story. Such a book as E. G. Swain's *The Stoneground Ghost Tales* patently aud avowedly owes its inspiration to his genius.

Miss Scarborough again has no mention of Mrs Nesbit's sombre little collection, *Grim Tales*, one of the stories in which for sheer gruesome horror it would be hard to beat. Vernon Lee's *Hauntings*, four weirdly fantastic studies of extraordinary power and great literary beauty in a scholarly setting, cannot be forgotten, and Lucas Malet's

The Gateless Barrier is a novel full of delicate charm, and one which presents no shallow philosophy of the supernatural. *Cecilia de Noël* is famous for its clever characterization and has long since taken its place as a little classic gem of ghost lore. *Raw Edges* by Perceval Landon has several uncanny, and one supremely terrible story, *Thurnley Abbey*, which tells of a building hideously haunted by a foul and carious skeleton. All these, which are of prime importance, and others of lesser note, Miss Scarborough has unwisely omitted to describe in her recent study.

We find moreover only one reference to the name of W. H. Ainsworth, and that casually in a list of some half-a-dozen writers. Ainsworth's faults are great, very great, but he assuredly ought not to be dismissed in so summary a manner. For all his clumsiness and Wardour-street vocabulary, he had parts, and *Auriol, The Lancashire Witches, Rookwood*, to mention only three of many, are soaked in the macabre. Nor are we at all sure that in such a comprehensive study G. W. M. Reynolds too has not distinct claims to a place however lowly. His works are confessedly ranting melodrama and have worse defects than dubious grammar and grandiloquent bathos. They belong to the slums and alleys of fiction, but Reynolds was prolific and won notoriety in his day. *The Necromancer; Wagner, the Wehr Wolf; Faust* (quantum mutatus ab illo !)—and a score beside—are very grimoires of cheap diablerie. Far above this *London Journal* romancer stands Sheridan Le Fanu, a writer whose talents are of a very high order. *In a Glass Darkly* (which has sometimes been reprinted as *Green Tea*), is incredibly morbid, horrible, and arresting; *The Dragon Volant* with its tangles and mysteries far surpasses more modern developments of the same theme; *Uncle Silas* is a study which has often been repeated but perhaps never quite so well. There is no account of Le Fanu in Miss Scarborough's pages. An even more astonishing omission is the name of Monsignor Hugh Benson, whose personal interest in the occult was so well known, and whose *Mirror of Shalott* and *The Necromancers* aroused so much discussion a decade or so ago. By reason of those ghastly tales, *The Room in the Tower*, Mr E. F. Benson also has established an undeniable right to inclusion in a study of the supernatural in fiction, where too we might expect to meet with the *Ghost Stories* of E. and H. Heron, a book which has distinctive features worthy of note.

Though none of these are included, and such omissions are serious, Miss Scarborough has nevertheless brought together and compared a very great number of works in which the supernatural has a place, and a study which is so extensive as hers cannot but be of great value and interest. Now-a-days the occult is receiving much serious attention, and it was indeed high time for the entrancing subject of the supernatural in literature to be dealt with at length and in detail. It has been much neglected. Miss Scarborough indeed says 'there has been no previous book on the topic, and none related to it, save Mr C. E. Whitmore's work on *The Supernatural in Tragedy*,' a statement which we are unable wholly to endorse when we recall Thurnau's *Die Geister* *in der eng. Literatur des* 18. *Jahrhunderts* (1906), a slight yet pioneer contribution in this all-important field.

It is good to find that in her first chapter, 'The Gothic Romance,' Miss Scarborough breaks away from the beaten track and has ample references to little known but entirely characteristic romances such as Charlotte Dacre's *Zofloya, or, The Moor* (1806), and T. J. Horsley-Curties' *The Ancient Records of the Abbey of St Oswyth* (1801), rather than to more easily accessible and somewhat stereotyped exemplars of that school. It will be remembered that Barham in *The Spectre of Tappington* has a good-natured laugh at 'that eminent antiquary, Mr Horsley-Curties,' who described a pointed arch as 'a *Gothic* window of the *Saxon* order.' But that unique and unrelated classic in English literature, *The Ingoldsby Legends*, is not mentioned by Miss Scarborough, and even if it be pleaded that out of some sixty or more pieces only half-a-dozen are prose, yet *The Leech of Folkestone*, *Singular Passage in the Life of the Late Henry Harris, D.D.*, and *Jerry Jarvis' Wig*, albeit grotesque, are sinister to a degree and told as few writers could have narrated them. For all his mockery and quips Barham (paradoxical as it may appear) treated the supernatural seriously. He well knew that without a vein of grim earnest underlying superficial flippancies and fun the macabre in literature is naught. Even if we do not take the supernatural seriously we must take the treatment of it in literature seriously. This Oscar Wilde appreciated when he ended his 'hylo-idealistic' *The Canterville Ghost* upon a note of deep pathos and exquisite poetry. Although she has frequent references to Wilde, Miss Scarborough curiously enough does not instance this amusing and pertinent tale.

It is obvious that Miss Scarborough completely underestimates the rare genius of Ann Radcliffe; she does not even mention (save in an excerpt from *Northanger Abbey*) that poignant psychological study, *The Italian*, and she entirely fails to appreciate the importance of this great mistress of romance. The faults and follies of a crowd of servile imitators —Horsley-Curties went so far as to name one of his novels *The Monk of Udolpho*—have to some extent obscured the fame of 'the mighty magician of Udolpho,' and blinded by the demerits of her literary parasites, few, if any, critics have given Mrs Radcliffe her ample meed of praise. Miss Scarborough very properly quotes at some length that delightful scene where Isabella Thorpe reads over to Catherine Miss Andrews' famous list of 'horrid' romances, but through some error she counts eight titles not seven. She writes with pardonable pride that she has traced the authorship of 'four out of the eight.' The whole seven however had been identified and examined long before her investigations. Some account of these novels was given by me in a letter to *The Times Literary Supplement*, Dec. 27, 1917, and yet fuller details may be found in my lecture on Mrs Radcliffe (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, second series, XXXV, pp. 39—77).

Miss Scarborough, when giving a list of those writers who have made use of the legend of the Wandering Jew (p. 180), ought certainly to have included Lewis. Ahasuerus plays an important part in one of the chief episodes of *The Monk*. The theme of the Flying Dutchman deserves more than a short and superficial paragraph (p. 187), which takes no account of Marryat's fine story *The Phantom Ship*. The werewolf is treated at length, but Baring-Gould's *The Book of Were-Wolves*, first published as far back as 1865, receives no mention. There is too a little-known but exceedingly beautiful fantasy by the late Count Eric Stenbok, *The Other Side*, which tells of the loup-garou and the 'wolf-keeper' with his horrible half-human troupe. Attention should have been drawn to this if only to praise the rare loveliness of its literary grace. And surely it is a mistake not to give one of the earliest of all were-wolf stories, the anecdote told by Niceros which made Trimalchio's guests shiver and stare: 'luna lucebat tanquam meridie. Venimus inter monimenta...deinde ut respexi ad comitem ille exuit se et omnia vestimenta secundum viam posuit...subito lupus factus est.' The belief in lycanthropy is, of course, extremely ancient and wide-spread. Amongst other authors, Herodotus; Vergil, *Eclog.* VIII, 95—99; Strabo; Pliny; Solinus; Pomponius Mela; Dionysius Afer; Varro; S. Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, XVIII; all mention the superstition. Several pages on the supernatural in classical literature would have been highly desirable. It is almost incredible that Miss Scarborough has only one quite casual reference to Apuleius, that past-master of magic and the macabre. Even this reference is third-hand, being taken from Warton's notes on Milton, as quoted by Dyce in his introduction to Peele's *The Old Wives' Tale*.

With regard to the semi-Oriental idea of metempsychosis (p. 189), that the soul may pass into another human body, into an animal, a plant, or even (as used in literature) into some inanimate object, Dr Hawkesworth, who is quoted by Miss Scarborough, probably drew something from *Le Canapé couleur de Feu* (1714), a little fairy tale in eleven chapters, often attributed to Gresset, but in reality the work of Fougeret de Montbron. The hero is first transformed into a dog and then into a sofa. Hence Crébillon le fils drew his inspiration for *Le Sopha*; *Ah Quel Conte*; and other comic novels, a vein which has been well worked by succeeding writers. In the classics we have Ovid's encyclopaedic *Metamorphoses*.

The Doppelgänger, the double or dual personality, is discussed at some length by Miss Scarborough, and she has collected several very interesting instances. It has been stated that these stories have their origin in Calderon's *El Embozado*, where a man is haunted by himself. I would rather suggest that they are but the presentation in literature of the mystical phenomenon of bi-location, which often appears in modern occultism as the Thought-Body. S. Thomas speaks at length of double personality, and there is much profound matter on the subject in Cardinal Cajetan's *Commentaries* on S. Thomas. According to the Dominican doctor bi-location proper never does and never could happen, but bi-location improperly so called and technically termed *raptus* does occur, and is identical with the double. S. Thomas quotes instances from the Bible (*Ezekiel* viii; etc.) and from the Lives of the Saints. Calderon, a priest and a theologian, must have been intimately acquainted with this doctrine.

It is doubtful whether on the whole a more comprehensive view of the supernatural in fiction than this given by Miss Scarborough could easily have been contained in one volume. It is true that there are, as we have noted, omissions. There is repetition which is quite unnecessary, and more than one chapter might have been compressed with manifest advantage. But, even as the case stands, the ground which has been covered is very large, and we cannot but give a warm welcome to Miss Scarborough's achievement, which, it is certain, involved long and laborious research. All students of fiction are deeply in her debt. We would caution her however to pay careful attention to the felicities of style. Her own diction, often vivid and modern, occasionally slips into spurious slang, a pitfall to be shunned. That her study will arouse further interest in these investigations is greatly to be desired. We hope that one day the history of that school initiated by *Otranto* and inspired by Mrs Radcliffe will be written in detail. Hardly any branch of literature is less known. The output was tremendous, and the work will be tremendous too, but if the material can be collected—which is in itself a moot point—an addition of prime importance will then have been made to the history of English fiction.

MONTAGUE SUMMERS.

LONDON.

Wordsworth's Theory of Poetic Diction. A study of the historical and personal background of the Lyrical Ballads. By MARJORIE LATTA BARSTOW. (*Yale Studies in English*, LVII.) Newhaven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1917. 8vo. xv + 182 pp.

Our difficulty with this book, which is, to quote the preface, a 'doctoral' dissertation presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Yale University, is to understand for precisely what class of public it is intended. Miss Barstow admits in her Introduction the amount of work accomplished by students, from Coleridge to Professor Harper, upon her chosen subject, but at the same time assures us that 'the world has never taken Wordsworth's so-called theory of poetic diction seriously.' By 'the world' we presume she means the general public: she acknowledges, in fact, that her object in writing is to 'dispel *popular* misconceptions.' This can only imply that for scholars she has nothing new to say. Nor, in truth, has she. Her book contains no original contribution whatever to Wordsworthian criticism. Its main theme—the injustice of much of Coleridge's criticism of Wordsworth's famous Preface—is to Wordsworthians simply hackneyed, and had Miss Barstow referred to the *Encyclopædia Britannica* she would there have found a 'popular' article on Wordsworth by the late

Professor Minto in which that fine critic and scholar anticipates almost all of value that she has to say. Section by section her book is but a restatement of facts and opinions with which any student could make himself familiar by merely consulting a good history of English Literature. Yet we have always understood that that particular species of composition called a 'doctoral' dissertation was encouraged, and its publication permitted (or excused), only on the assumption that some measure of original research should be involved in its production, and some genuine, even if only modest, contribution to the *expert's* knowledge of the subject dealt with should be discernible in its results. Even considered as a work *ad populum* Miss Barstow's book leaves much to be desired. What she has tried to do may be stated in her own words: 'Accepting the poet's own declaration that anyone who cares to study the question will see that his principles are in accordance with the best traditions of English Literature, I have begun with a review of the theories of poetic diction in England before the time of Wordsworth. Then, in the light of this study and of such scanty evidence as we possess, I have tried to reconstruct the processes of critical thought which were responsible for the experiment of the *Lyrical Ballads*, and to show exactly how this thought affected his style—his vocabulary, his syntax and his rhetorical devices then and afterwards.' In the historical review with which she begins her dissertation she dismisses the whole of English poetry from Chaucer to Milton in nineteen pages. Her argument that Wordsworth 're-discovered the principles of English poetry' as illustrated in all England's greatest poets requires a far more detailed examination of the diction of these poets than she is ready or seems qualified to make. She asserts, for instance, that 'when we place him where he consciously belonged, in the main stream of the European Renaissance, we discover that Milton too is expressing in terms of his continental relationships the ideal we have discovered...in the prefaces of Wordsworth.' That ideal was (as stated by Miss Barstow) that the language of poetry 'should be "a selection of the real language of men" in a state of vivid sensation.' It is true, of course, that Milton wrote *Paradise Lost* in the 'real language of men' in so far as he chose to write it in English, not Latin. But in a comparison between him and Wordsworth in the matter of poetic diction this fact seems quite beside the point. The question is whether he wrote in the *real* language of Englishmen in Wordsworth's sense, or in a diction as highly artificial as Wordsworth's in the *Lyrical Ballads* was intended to be natural. Miss Barstow should have established the fact that his practice in this matter accorded with Wordsworth's if she wished to prove that the two men's ideals of the diction appropriate for poetry were as she claims identical. Miss Barstow's chapters on the 'personal background' of the *Lyrical Ballads* are made up of material almost entirely derived from Coleridge and from Professor Legouis's *Early Life of William Wordsworth*, of which she quotes whole pages. We are told in the introduction to Miss Barstow's work that the *Lyrical Ballads* were only an experiment and that the theory of poetic diction there embodied was later profoundly modified by Wordsworth. This being so, the elaborate analysis (in the final chapter) of the style and syntax of these poems seems hardly worth the trouble spent on it. Miss Barstow's own style strives too much to be effective and she has an annoying partiality for the adjective 'vital.' Her book as a study of one phase of Wordsworth's poetical development if unoriginal is painstaking and not without promise; but, as a 'doctoral dissertation,' it has either accomplished too little or attempted too much, and 'vitality' (to use her favourite word) is precisely what it lacks.

G. L. BICKERSTETH.

LONDON.

Life of John Keats. By Sir SIDNEY COLVIN. London: Macmillan & Co. 1917. 8vo. xviii + 598 pp.

The average reader as he first turns the pages of this book—a biography of one who died at twenty-six—may be excused for wondering what would have happened to the poet biographically if he had lived out the allotted span.. This record of the poetical life of Keats is that of some seven or eight years. Suppose the average, and that instead we had had some twenty-seven or thirty-eight to deal with, to what length would it have extended?

But such considerations are based on a fallacy. It would be merely impertinent to say now, in view of his splendid achievements, that the interest of Keats's poetry is chiefly that of promise. Yet the biographical interest is undoubtedly that of promise rather than achievement. Keats all his short life was a 'trier,' the most magnificent of 'triers[1],' and it was therefore proper that his poetical character should be subjected to this patient and loving scrutiny. If one has any quarrel with Sir Sidney Colvin it is not at all for the minuteness of the biographical portion, but only in regard to the proportionate detail of the criticism that is purely literary. Most books gain by being shorter, and, as a sympathetic reader said to the present writer, the essential poetical facts about Keats would perhaps have stood out larger if there had been some sacrifice of appreciative analysis. For example, Chapter IV on the poems of 1817 and the two chapters on *Endymion* tell us, for their length, comparatively little that is novel; while Chapter X, with its account of the reviews, and Chapters XVI and XVII, with their beautifully quiet disclosure of the character of their subject, are, as nearly as may be, models of how poetical biography should be written. Indeed it is the achievement of this book that tempts one to these preliminary observations, nor is it improper to dream of the perfecting of a volume that is likely to be standardised. For what Sir Sidney Colvin has accomplished here is no small thing. He has substituted in the popular literary conception, and finally, the real Keats—a youth of great strength and some weaknesses—for the effeminate weakling who died hard; and he has done this with a delicacy, a minuteness, and a justness of judgment that displaces his own admirable monograph of thirty years ago.

---

[1] 'Had I been nervous about its (the slipshod *Endymion*) being a perfect piece, and with that view asked advice and trembled over every page, it would never have been written.' And much later, towards the close of 1820—'I am afraid I shall pop off just when my mind is able to run alone' (Buxton Forman, 1883, vol. IV, p. 89).

Criticism so little pressed, as careful and as ripe, could come only from a veteran of letters. What better elucidation could one have than the explanation on pages 155 and 266 of what exactly the poet meant by a life of 'sensations rather than of thoughts'? What clearer light than that thrown on the genesis of the style of *The Earthly Paradise* by the citation on page 439 of the passage from *The Eve of St Mark*; or what better comment than that on the *Ode to Autumn* on page 422? 'In the first stanza the bounty, in the last the pensiveness of the time are expressed in words so transparent and direct that we almost forget they are words at all, and nature herself and the season seem speaking to us.' More detailed but equally to be accepted are the conclusions on the composite nature of the art sources of the *Grecian Urn*, and of Bacchus and his rout.

Yet the merit of the book consists not so much in its judgments, however just, as in its full presentation of material in support of judgment. Here is literally all the information about Keats and his companions—I mean as they affected Keats—that has continuing literary interest. A distinction long overdue is drawn between Haydon's overblown ambition and his remarkable powers of human portraiture: Keats's acquaintance with Shelley ('Shelley's voice,' said Lamb after his death, 'was the most obnoxious squeak I ever was tormented with') is shown to have been in reality considerable; and that with Wordsworth[1], as also Keats's admiration of Wordsworth's poetry, is marked with its proper emphasis. Keats himself as he appeared in the flesh comes back by the aid of quotation or by the author's own discriminating use of words:—'A small, compact, well-turned figure, broad-chested for its height, which was barely an inch over five feet; a shapely head set off by thickly clustering gold-brown hair and carried with an eager upward and forward thrust from the shoulders,' which goes well with a sentence happily selected:—'Though a quarrel in the streets is to be hated, the energies displayed in it,' once said the exaggerating poet, 'are fine; the commonest man shows a grace in his quarrel.' Finally, in this record the causes of the physical breakdown are traceable step by step—the Scotch tour with Brown when he caught a violent cold (in all there were 642 miles of tramping), the nursing of his dying brother Tom, the climate of Shanklin and an outside on the Hampstead stage-coach on a February 3rd, all preparatory to the squalor of the rough voyage to Italy. This is merely to say that we have cause to be grateful to Sir Sidney Colvin for the definitive *Life of Keats*.

---

[1] 'Although the great man could praise or care for no contemporary poetry save his own, and had none of the sympathetic or encouraging criticism to bestow on Keats which to that ardent young spirit would have meant so much, he nevertheless showed him no little personal kindness, receiving him when he called and inviting him several times to dine or sup.'

Reading it, the present writer has been struck by the clearer demonstration of several matters previously imperfectly apprehended.

The poet's indebtedness to the Jacobeans, on which Mr Elton has remarked, is here made evident by abundant quotation, and there is a surprisingly close parallel in manner between a passage chosen from *Britannia's Pastorals* on page 98 and one from Keats's first Epistle on page 110.

The occasionally easy largeness of Keats's opening style is also freshly brought out, by the admirable:

> with a sound
> Haply, like dolphin tumults, when sweet shells
> Welcome the float of Thetis[1],

or by the lines in *Sleep and Poetry*:

> And some are hearing eagerly, the wild
> Thrilling liquidity of dewy piping,

where the attempt to get the thing exactly expressed is what is striking, or by reference to the sonnet on the Parthenon Marbles where the poet says that 'these wonders' bring round the heart

> a most dizzy pain,
> That mingles Grecian grandeur with the rude
> Wasting of old Time—with a billowy main—
> A sun—*a shadow of a magnitude.*

'He strives faithfully,' writes Sir Sidney Colvin, 'to get into words the confused sensations of spiritual infirmity and awe that have overpowered him.'

Perhaps, of all Sir Sidney Colvin has brought out, that which is brought out best is the penetrating power of Keats's literary criticisms. It is not technically a discovery, of course, for these criticisms were always there for us to read in any serviceable collection of his letters, but it is a discovery of arrangement. We owe it to the biographer's selective art that Keats's power as a literary critic is the thing that strikes one most, and most newly, in reading this biography. We need not to remember that it was a young man in the early twenties who wrote them; they would be remarkable from one of any age, forming indeed, though a small part, the most fertile and original part of English poetical criticism.

Keats was eminently an emotional poet; and though poetry is a matter of emotion there is too little else in his poetry. The intellect, if we are to judge by the standard of the greatest poetry, is not there in sufficient play, was not yet there in sufficient play to supply a Shakespearean balance. Whether it would ever have been is in doubt, for, though Keats was ripening with extreme rapidity, poetry is an emotional business, and it would be natural to suppose that he would always have given free rein to the faculty which was at once his own foremost faculty and that which for poetry is primarily requisite. Personally, though I know the view is now heretical, I do not doubt that the poetry of Keats would have been always over-full on this side.

---

[1] Another *Endymion* passage equally illustrating this is:

> 'Caverns lone, farewell!
> And air of visions, and the monstrous swell
> Of visionary seas!'

But criticism is not primarily an emotional business, but one of the mind. Its triumphs are won by the long exercise of intellect and judgment. One comes by assiduous practice to think approximately rightly. More than this is not generally to be hoped for. There are few young men who are good critics and few old men who are entirely bad ones. Its weakness, therefore, is that, after all, it approaches, and especially where it is soundest and oldest, to what is really a vain effort, the attempt to express one thing in the terms of another, being indeed too often but a purely intellectual appreciation of what is always chiefly an emotional product.

This weakness of poetical criticism, not of English criticism only but, owing to our national deficiency in the *sensibilité* of the Latin races, especially apparent in English criticism, is not found at all in the criticisms of Keats. His over-development on the emotional side saved him at least from this—the bare intellectualism of the ordinary critic of poetry. What is needed most in our poetical criticism to-day is that, without losing its rightness, it should trust its emotions more. And Keats supplies this need. His greatness as a poet, and particularly as one concerned with the basic matter of poetry, is what enables him to do so, gives him the familiarity with poetical effects and the surety, the niceness of immediate hearing, which are so great a part of the equipment of the perfect critic.

The charming Shelley is not less tenuous or more trustworthy in his poetical criticisms than in his poetry, a poetry which is properly enough to be designated his criticism of life. Where he is soundest, and not unnaturally, for his interests were intellectual and academic, is in the generalisations of Æsthetics. Wordsworth, need it be said? was always a very good critic of poetry, a man of his knowledge and commanding intellect could not but be so, but he is a supreme poetical critic only when he is dealing with his own poetry, to him, supremely and rightly, a matter of high emotional concern and in dealing with which his own feeling was deeply stirred. But Wordsworth's criticism of *The Leech-gatherer* is not better than Keats's criticisms of Shakespeare. At his best, for there are some early gropings, Keats gets at the feeling of Shakespeare as surely as Wordsworth gets at the feeling of his own poems.

Of Keats's general criticisms, criticisms of men and affairs and places, one is always surprised by the rightness, 'putting his fist through,' like nothing so much as occasional phrases in the extraordinary letters of Burns.

Margate is a 'treeless affair,' and the lack in the Scotch Border scenery is thus emphasised by a sally in contrasts:—'I know not how it is, the clouds, the sky, the houses, all seem anti-Grecian, and anti-

Charlemagnish.' His eye too notes small things:—'Now I would not care, if he would change a little. I say now, why not take out his pen first sometimes? But I might as well tell a hen to hold up her head before she drinks instead of afterwards,' small things, and, equally, big things, the small concrete and the large abstract:—'The best of men have but a portion of good in them—a kind of spiritual yeast in their frames which creates the ferment of existence.'

These are all sayings that make you stop and listen; the man who says them has considered things and his advice about living is likely to be valuable. It may be asked 'Can any advice about living be really valuable? is it not certain to be trite or merely apophthegmatical?' Not valuable in substance perhaps, but it may be in its tone:—

'I have Fanny and I have you—three people whose Happiness to me is sacred—and it does annul that selfish sorrow which I should otherwise fall into, living as I do with poor Tom who looks upon me as his only comfort—the tears will come into your Eyes—let them—and embrace each other—thank heaven for what happiness you have, and after thinking a moment or two that you suffer in common with all Mankind hold it not a sin to regain your cheerfulness.'

We are in the mood to listen to this writer. He will have something new to say or at any rate new to feel when we come to subjects specifically literary. Here for example on the long poem is a remark I do not remember to have read in Mr Bradley:—'I have heard Hunt say, and I may be asked—why endeavour after a long Poem? To which I should answer, Do not the Lovers of Poetry like to have a little Region to wander in, where they may pick and choose, and in which the images are so numerous that many are forgotten and found new in a second Reading?' And here is a self-criticism just as perfect as any of Wordsworth's:—'Some time since I began a poem called "The Eve of St Mark," quite in the spirit of town quietude. I think it will give you the sensation of walking about an old country town on a coolish evening.'

As to Shakespeare the main fact about him comes out quite early, before Keats had begun his own *Endymion*:—'Whenever you write say a word or two on some Passage in Shakespeare that may have come rather new to you, which must be continually happening, notwithstanding that we read the same Play forty times.' In the same year, 1817, he has this particular reflexion:—'I never found so many beauties in the Sonnets—they seem to be full of fine things said unintentionally—in the intensity of working out conceits,' which is perhaps the best criticism ever passed on the 'secret' of the Sonnets. Indeed no one was ever nearer to the heart of the whole Shakespearean 'secret' than this young man of twenty-two:—'I had not a dispute, but a disquisition, with Dilke upon various subjects; several things dove-tailed in my mind, and at once it struck me what quality went to form a man of achievement, especially in literature, and which Shakespeare possessed so enormously—I mean *Negative Capability*, that is, when a man is capable of being in uncertainties, mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact and reason.'

Surely all this justifies that early counsel of Haydon's that now reads rather absurdly:—'collect incident, study character, read Shakespeare, and trust in Providence, and you will do, you must.'

But we should not part from one who was also the best of English Miltonisers without hearing what he has to say on Milton: 'he had come to regard "Paradise Lost,"' says Sir Sidney Colvin writing of September 1819, 'though so fine itself,' as a 'corruption of our language,' a case of 'a northern dialect accommodating itself to Greek and Latin inversions and intonations'; and had convinced himself, paradoxically, that the purest English was Chatterton's.... But it was probably not of Chatterton's vocabulary that Keats was thinking, but rather of the unartificial, straightforward flow of his verse in contrast with Milton's.' Assuredly, and the turn from Milton to Chatterton is a beautiful instance of his instinct for the right flow of the language:—'I have given up Hyperion—there were too many Miltonic inversions in it—Miltonic verse cannot be written but in an artful, or rather, artist's humour. I wish to give myself up to other sensations. English ought to be kept up.'

What might not so sound an intuition have accomplished? It is not easy to become the first of English poets, but Keats bade fair, had he lived, to have been the first of English critics.

A. A. JACK.

ABERDEEN.

Letterature moderne. Studi diretti da ARTURO FARINELLI. I. A. FARINELLI, *La Vita è un Sogno: Preludi al Dramma di Calderon.* 8vo. xi + 326 pp.; II. A. FARINELLI, *La Vita è un Sogno: Concezione della Vita e del Mondo nel Calderon; il Dramma.* 457 pp.; III. GIUSEPPE GABETTI, *Il Dramma di Zacharias Werner.* 455 pp.; IV. G. A. ALFERO, *Novalis e il suo Heinrich von Ofterdingen.* vii + 374 pp.; V. SCIPIO SLATAPER, *Ibsen.* xxv + 331 pp. Turin: Fratelli Bocca. 1916.

With these five volumes Professor Arturo Farinelli has inaugurated a collection of studies in modern literatures which will be welcomed far beyond the boundaries of Italy. The series has been born in troublous times when 'every voice of concord is drowned in the diabolic symphony' of the Great War, but, the editor tells us, it is inspired, none the less, by 'a faith in the spiritual brotherhood of the nations' which has never wavered in him. And, as a testimony to that faith, three of the volumes are devoted to Germanic themes, while through the editor's own two volumes there blows at times the keener air of the north of Europe.

It would be a mistake to infer from the title of Farinelli's work that what he has to offer us is merely an introduction to or study of Calderón's *La Vida es sueño.* There are dramas in the literature of the world which have evoked a large exegetical literature: that of *Hamlet* would form a small library: that of *Faust* is stupendous: but even the most fervent admirer of Calderón would hardly be prepared to claim that that writer's most famous drama provides material for so bulky a study as the present one. As a matter of fact, Farinelli's work is very much more than a study of Calderón. The play is his central point: but he begins to draw his circles so very far out that through a large part of the work one has no clear vision of the centre at all: it is lost, in fact, owing to the very remoteness of the periphery. 'Calderon mi parve semplice pretesto per seguire nelle spire dei tempi il concetto fondamentale dalla vita a cui s'informava il dramma che tutti acclamano e pochissimi intendono...l'esame del dramma "La Vida es sueño" vi figura come necessario complemento del primo studio.' Farinelli seeks the roots of Calderón's philosophy in the orient, where the dream has always been esteemed higher than the reality, where the nullity of the body is contrasted with the eternity of the spirit. He goes on to show how essentially antipathetic such abnegation is to Hellenic thought: how the 'Eternal Yea' of Greek poetry asserts and reasserts the potent virtues of the earthly life, rejoices in the sunlight of reality and turns with loathing from the shadowy, joyless dream-world of Hades. Then, once more, the spirit of Oriental renunciation, the pessimistic harping on the nothingness of life, creeps in with the Christianity of the Middle Ages, and the spiritual and the unseen become again the only reality. From the *De contemptu mundi* to *La Vida es sueño* is only a step: the potentiality of the dream in modern literature springs from the asceticism of the Middle Ages. From these wide considerations of the philosophic basis of Calderón's drama Farinelli turns to forerunners of Calderón who have employed the dream-motive dramatically, such as Shakespeare, Hollonius (*Somnium Vitae humanae*), Hans Sachs: he examines the very large share which the glorification of death over life, of the dream-world over the real world, has in Spanish literature itself. And in this connection these volumes contain no more subtle or suggestive criticism than where Farinelli shows how *Don Quixote* is in its essential basis one long drawn-out conflict between life and the dream. Thus his book is a study of the dream-motive in all literatures—from England and Holland to the East, from Spain and Italy to Scandinavia—of the changing values in poetry of the seen and the unseen; of the 'to be' and 'not to be,' of pessimism and optimism, as spiritual forces in the poetry of the world.

The second volume deals more particularly with Calderón, and opens with a comprehensive study of Calderón's thought, his attitude to life and the world. Few of the great poets of the world have proved themselves such chameleons under the light of successive epochs of criticism: and amidst these conflicting views Farinelli proves a helpful guide. He discusses the traditional claims, which won for Calderón the first place in the Romantic heart, to metaphysical profundity, and shows on how insubstantial a basis they are founded: the real test of a poet's depth is not the mere utterance of profound thoughts; these thoughts must also be alive, be capable of growth, have powers of fertilisation. Whereas Calderón's profundities are too often merely the expression of dead and stiffened dogmas. Considerable space is devoted to the attitude to Calderón of Goethe, who was permeated by the Romantic estimate of Calderón—indeed, one sees here just how Romantic the classic Olympian could be. It was Schlegel who created the modern European opinion of Calderón: and yet Schlegel's Calderón was no more the real Calderón than Lowell's 'Arab soul in Spanish feathers.' Farinelli has given us a most fascinating study of one of the great themes of literature, and the promised third volume of 'Epilogues' will be looked forward to with eager anticipation.

The work is provided with a full and helpful bibliographical commentary of nearly two hundred pages in the aggregate; and it is to be hoped that Volume III will bring a complete Index to the whole work which will facilitate reference to its wealth of detail. Should the book reach a second edition, a revision would be desirable of the English quotations: they are frequently disfigured by slips and misprints.

Volumes II and III of the series deal with two writers of the German Romantic movement, and no doubt owe something to the direct stimulus and inspiration of the editor, who published some suggestive introductory lectures on that movement seven or eight years ago. Of the two, Gabetti's volume on Werner has afforded the better opportunity; less has been written on this prodigal son of Romanticism than on its high-priest Novalis; and Gabetti has turned this opportunity to the best advantage. He has rightly grasped Werner's significance as the representative playwright of the first phase of Romanticism, of a movement that had strangely little aptitude for the drama, that spurned the laws and conventions of the drama—beat incessantly, as it were, against the prison-bars of the theatre—and yet produced matchless translations of Shakespeare and Calderón. Gabetti has, it seems to me, brought into clearer light than any of his predecessors the specifically Romantic nature of Werner's drama; he has laid weight on the close ties which bound Werner's thought, especially his mysticism, to that of the leaders of the Romantic School. Moreover, the conflict which runs through all Werner's work, and which frequently appears there in such offensively garish colours, the conflict between religious asceticism and sensuality, lies more or less decorously concealed behind much of the literature of German Romanticism. Gabetti has not merely given us full critical analyses of the better plays of Werner's earlier life, but he has also worked conscientiously through the last weary dramas of what he calls the 'catholic' group. If there is room for complaint, it is that he might have had more to say of the one drama which still possesses a certain spark of life, *Der vierundzwanzigste Februar*, and of the vexed question—one that has a peculiar interest for us in England—of the genesis and development of the group of 'fate-dramas' which it initiated. Gabetti will hardly make Werner a more read, or more readable poet; but he has given us an able and interesting study, and, after all, one must not forget that so cosmopolitan a critic as Madame de Staël regarded Werner as the greatest dramatic poet in Germany in the period immediately subsequent to Schiller's death; he was in any case a force of magnitude in the evolution of the German drama through Kleist and Grabbe to Grillparzer and even Hebbel.

To write a new book on Novalis needs some courage; the last fifteen or twenty years have been so fertile in Novalis-literature in Germany and France, that there might seem to be little left for a new critic but to offer a critical synthesis of his predecessors' work and views. But Alfero has done much more than this; he has attacked on independent lines the still unsolved problems. He has tried to explain, for instance, the extraordinary inconsistency between the practical, methodical, conscientious official, Friedrich von Hardenberg, and the unworldly Romantic dreamer Novalis; between the precocious, ill-educated child, Sophie von Kühn, and the idealised Sophie of the poet's dream. I am not sure that he has succeeded in putting these biographical matters in a very plausible light; but we must at least be grateful to him for effectively discomfiting those 'modern' critics who talk so glibly of Novalis's 'pose.' The centre of gravity of Alfero's book is not, however, Novalis's life, but his *Heinrich von Ofterdingen.* And he has produced a lucid and sympathetic guide to that least worldly of Romantic allegories. On this Odyssey of the poetic soul through a romantically impossible Middle Ages Alfero has brought to bear the sense for concrete realities and plain facts which is characteristic of the Latin mind; he is able to appreciate the subtle poetry of Novalis's transcendentalism, without himself becoming mystic and transcendental. As for the fascinating problem of the unwritten second volume of the romance, the 'Erfüllung,' Alfero's conclusion is, I take it, that it is insoluble. The fragments left to us are frankly irreconcilable; Novalis did not himself know whither he was being led. Like all the Romantic novels, *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* is a fragment; but this is due to a deeper reason than the tragic fate that cut short the poet's life: 'Se il poeta fosse vissuto fino a compiere il suo romanzo, questo sarebbe stato, com' oggi è, frammento.'

Towards the end of his volume Alfero deals with the sources of Novalis's romance, especially its relation to *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* and *Franz Sternbalds Wanderungen.* He has little to add here to what has already been said, although something more might have been made of the overshadowing influence of Goethe's novel. But Alfero has suggestive things to say of the possible influence of Tieck's *Genoveva.* On the other side—Novalis's influence on his successors—Alfero hints that the birth of Astralis, the son of Heinrich and Mathilde, might have served as a suggestion for Euphorion in the second part of *Faust*; but he might also, I think, have made out a case for Novalis's share in moulding the essentially Romantic ethics of Goethe's *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre.* The 'blue flower'—how much more Romantic 'il fiore azzurro' sounds than 'die blaue Blume'!—too, remains the mystery it has always been; but a more detailed examination of the various interpretations of its symbolism might have been worth while. Altogether, this is a singularly illuminating study of a fascinating theme; but it would have proved pleasanter and smoother reading—this criticism also holds good of Gabetti's volume—had the author been less a slave to scientific accuracy, and presented his poet in translation, instead of interlarding his text with constant direct quotations from the German. In both books, it should be added, the German quotations are not free from orthographic errors.

The last volume I have to mention has a melancholy interest attached to it: the author, himself a native of the 'Italia irredenta,' has fallen in Italy's fight for the unity of her race. His study of Ibsen is not so patently academic as its predecessors. We cannot complain of the quotation of Ibsen in the original text; rather we sometimes feel that the author might have left more untranslated—if only the titles of Ibsen's own works. But Slataper's book has a quite peculiar interest; it is, as far as I am aware, the first work of some magnitude on Ibsen, by a critic who is emphatically 'young.' Here, indeed, the younger generation knocks, and knocks most vigorously, at the door! Slataper, who evidently approaches Ibsen through Hebbel, is free from the prejudices of older critics who were immediate contemporaries of the Ibsen drama; he has not felt the thrill which made *Et Dukkehjem, Gengangerne, Fruen fra Havet, Rosmersholm,* in their time seem revelations of a new world. His critical judgment is in consequence less hampered. He has no hesitation in relegating Ibsen's early works to a modest place amongst the artificial Germano-Scandinavian products of mid-century Romanticism, and who will gainsay him? He boldly tells us —almost taking our breath away—that *Peer Gynt,* so far from being the crowning achievement of Norwegian literature, is, in large part, 'stonato e falso,' the fourth act being, in particular, empty and redundant. On the other hand, he speaks with unexpected sympathy of the asceticism of *Brand.* He writes well of the *milieu* from which sprang alike *Les Fourchambault*, *En Fallit* and *Samfundets Stötter*, and vividly brings home to us just how far away those times are—dimly remote ages seen across these war-swept years. Slataper is not, however, free from disturbing prejudices; he has been unduly influenced by Otto Weininger's morbid and unbalanced views which had a great vogue in Vienna some ten years ago; and this does not make for clearness of vision. Of the later Ibsen plays only *Fruen fra Havet* meets with his emphatic disapproval; while he has not said all that might have been said on the unique place of *Rosmersholm* in modern tragedy. But his book is full of discerning criticism, and possesses a value quite other than that of the numerous analytic and genetic studies on Ibsen which have held the field in recent years.

There is a passage in this volume which the editor of the series in his sympathetic introduction has seized upon. I quote part of it:

> Leggendo, rileggendo, tornando a rileggere Ibsen, a un tratto vi prende una smania indicibile: aria! sangue! Riprendete Shakespeare. Ma vedetelo questo poeta felice, che lascia scorrazzar per il mondo tutti i suoi, senza una preoccupazione, senza un timore di dispersione!...Vivete padroni la vostra vita, fratelli miei! Andate alle vostre faccende, ai vostri amori e ai vostri dolori....Disperdetevi come vi piace per il mondo. Il poeta vi vuol bene così come siete. Egli è solo amore per voi.

There is, it is true, a touch of the platitudinous in this appeal from the drab and narrow world of Ibsen to Shakespeare; but Slataper's inferences are all his own. What he misses in Ibsen is the universal, serene affection that goes out from Shakespeare to all his creations. 'Che importano le "unità" quando c' è unità d'amore ?...Il suo regno è grande e ogni vizio e ogni virtu ci ha libero accesso, perchè vizio e virtù si coordinano nella fede interna, sicura, essenziale. La vita, tutta, è veramente santa.' Ibsen aspires, it is true, to this 'holy life,' but he cannot enter into it; he judges, but he cannot pardon. He is like that bard (not Heine, as Matthew Arnold thought, but Platen):

> Unnamed, who, Goethe said,
> Had every other gift, but wanted love;
> Love, without which the tongue
> Even of angels sounds amiss.

Ibsen, this vaunted realist, is, after all, compared with Shakespeare, not realist enough! May not this, perhaps, be one of the truths which the new generation, knocking at the door, has to bring home to us?

J. G. ROBERTSON.

LONDON.

Maistre Charles Fontaine, Parisien. By RICHMOND LAURIN HAWKINS. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1917. vii + 281 pp.

The doctrine of Platonic or spiritual love played a considerable and interesting, if not a highly important, part in French literature from 1540 to 1555. It inspired some notable conversations in the *Heptameron*, and, intermingled with religious mysticism, much of Margaret of Navarre's poetry; it formed the theme of Des Periers's *Queste d'amitié*, of Charles Fontaine's *La Contr'amye de Court*, of Heroet's *La Parfaicte Amye*, and of Maurice Scève's *Delie*; it figured largely in the writings of Charles de Sainte-Marthe; and it blended with Petrarchism in the *Olive* of Joachim Du Bellay and the *Erreurs amoureuses* of Pontus de Tyard. A chronological table will make this clear:

1537	Jacques Colin's translation of *Il Cortegiano.*
1540	Charles de Sainte-Marthe's *La Poesie françoise.*
1541	Des Periers's *Queste d'amitié.*
1542	Fontaine's *La Contr'amye de Court.*
„	Heroet's *La Parfaicte Amye.*
1544	Scève's *Delie.*
1545	Jean Martin's translation of Bembo's *Gli Asolani.*
1546	Symon Silvius's translation of Ficino's Latin commentary on the *Symposium.*
1547	Corrozet's *La conte du rossignol.*
„	*Les Marguerites de la Marguerite des princesses.*
1549	P. de Tyard's *Erreurs amoureuses.*
„	J. Du Bellay's *L'Olive.*

1550 J. Du Bellay's *L'Olive,* 2nd edition.
„ Sainte-Marthe's *Oraison funebre de Marguerite de Navarre.*
1551 P. de Tyard's *Continuation des Erreurs amoureuses.*
„ P. de Tyard's translation of Leone Hebreo's *Dialoghi di amore.*
1552 J. Du Bellay's *Sonnets de l'honneste amour.*
1554 *Les ruisseaux de Fontaine.*

It should be added by way of explanation that Des Periers's *Queste d'amitié* was probably presented, with his translation of Plato's *Lysis,* to Margaret of Navarre in 1541, though not printed till 1544, that the poems of Margaret which deal more particularly with spiritual love, whether among those published in her lifetime or among the *Dernières poésies,* were, according to her editor, M. Abel Lefranc, all written after 1540, and a good many after 1544, and that Du Bellay's *Sonnets de l'honneste amour* were printed in *Le Quatriesme livre de l'Eneide...autres Œuvres,* 1552 (N. S.). The chief impulse to all this literature came from the Queen of Navarre. M. Abel Lefranc says that she began to turn her attention to Platonism about the year 1540, and there are various indications to confirm this view. But she may have first become acquainted with the doctrine of spiritual love from the *Cortegiano,* where it is so eloquently expounded in the fourth book by Bembo, and of which a translation by Jacques Colin, the king's reader, was published in 1537. It was in 1541 that she conceived the idea of composing a new *Decameron,* which does not imply that some of the stories of the *Heptameron* were not written before this date. But it was not till 1546 that she put her project into execution, so that the epilogue to the eighth story which is one of the *loci classici* of Platonic love may be assigned with some probability to that year.

The appearance of Fontaine's name in the above list is the result of Mr Hawkins's careful and scholarly study of that writer, who has hitherto been chiefly known as an unoriginal follower of Marot and as the author of a single poem, the beautiful lines on the birth of his son. His chief contribution to the literature of Platonic love, the *Contr'amye de Court,* is interesting from the fact that it represents purely Platonic sources—mainly the *Symposium,* but also the *Phaedrus*—uncontaminated by any Neo-Platonic or mystical infiltration. In his last year at the Collège du Plessis (1530) he attended the lectures of the newly-appointed Regius Professor of Greek, Pierre Danès, but Mr Hawkins does not tell us whether he continued his Greek studies. In all probability, however, his knowledge of Plato was derived from Ficino's Latin version, an edition of which—the third published in France—was printed by Badius and Petit in 1533. Possibly it was Heroet who inspired him with his interest in Plato, for he and Heroet were in close touch with one another up to the time of his leaving Paris in 1540 (?), and as early as 1536 Heroet had presented his *Androgyne,* a paraphrase of the fantastic myth expounded by Aristophanes in the *Symposium,* to Francis I in manuscript. Mr Hawkins points out that the *Contr'amye* also contains borrowings from the third and fourth books of the *Cortegiano,* but that it keeps closer than that work to the *Symposium*. The freedom from Neo-Platonic influences may be due to the fact that Fontaine, unlike most of the writers in the above list, did not belong to the *entourage* of the Queen of Navarre. Mr Hawkins does not refer to the Platonism in *Les ruisseaux de Fontaine* (1555), but according to Miss Runtz-Rees (*Charles de Sainte-Marthe*, p. 311, n. 4) Fontaine here 'appears as the ardent convert and exponent of Platonism,' in contrast with his earlier volume, *La Fontaine d'Amour*, 1545, which 'marks an abrupt revulsion from Platonism.'

There are two interesting chapters on Fontaine and the Pléiade. Mr Hawkins has no difficulty in disposing of M. Roy's contention that the third poet referred to in the *Deffence* ('Un autre pour n'avoir encores rien mis en lumiere soubz son nom') is Fontaine. For my part I have no doubt that it is Saint-Gelais, and this is now M. Chamard's view (*La Deffence*, p. 182, n. 1). I feel almost equally sure that it is Saint-Gelais who is principally aimed at in Du Bellay's *Le Poëte-Courtisan*, though the satire may be also, as Mr Hawkins says, directed against a class. He is certainly right in rejecting M. Clément's theory that the courtier-poet is Fontaine.

As regards the merits of Fontaine's poetry, Mr Hawkins has no illusions. He frankly admits that he is 'as a poet mediocre.' But he claims that he has a certain importance from the point of view of the development of French poetry (pp. 228—230). In his final chapter he questions whether he is rightly classified as a member of the school of Marot, appealing to his learning, his Platonism, his response to Italian influences, his belief in the loftiness of the poet's mission. But he recognises that his work before the publication of the *Deffence* was 'more original and more like that of the Pléiade' than it was after the *Deffence*, when he became a 'pure disciple' of Marot, which more or less gives his contention away. After all it is not so much because of their learning or their Platonism or their imitation of Italian models that Heroet and Scève and Saint-Gelais are regarded as precursors of the Pléiade, as because the Pléiade so regarded them. As for Peletier M. Laumonier is, I believe, right in claiming him as an actual member of the Pléiade.

ARTHUR TILLEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

De Monarchia e De Vulgari Eloquentia, con le Epistolae e la Quaestio de Aqua et Terra, di DANTE ALIGHIERI. Firenze: G. Barbèra. 1917. 343 pp.

This dainty little volume forms part of a new issue of the well-known *Collezione Diamante* of G. Barbèra of Florence. The editor, whose name is withheld, has availed himself freely, but without acknowledgment of any kind, of the labours of his predecessors, notably of Prof. Pio Rajna's critical edition of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, and of the articles of Prof. Rostagno and Prof. Parodi, and of those of the present writer in this *Review*, so far as they were available, on the *Epistolae*. The text is beautifully printed, so far as type is concerned, but unfortunately it is disfigured by a large number of careless misprints, which make it quite untrustworthy for working purposes. In the *Epistolae* alone we have noted more than thirty misprints; viz. *quin* for *quid* (IV, 49)[1]; *novas* for *nova* (V, 3); *praemiandos* for *praemiando* (V, 42); *Caesaris* for *Caesari* (V, 152); *clavem* for *clavum* (p. 254); *pubblico* for *publico* (VI, 16); *satellitum* for *satellitium* (VII, 13); *successori* for *successor* (VII, 15); *Oceanis* for *Oceani* (VII, 59); *amplessus* for *amplexus* (VII, 147); *sacrosantae* for *sacrosanctae* (VII, 186); *intuens. Qui* for *intuens Qui* (VIII, 9–10); *ad commorantium* for *commorantium* (VIII, 59); *vox* for *vos* (VIII, 62); *sola* for *solam* (VIII, 144); *peregrinantem* for *peregrinante* (VIII, 181); *libertati* for *libertate* (X, 51); *variatur, a toto* for *variatur a toto* (X, 123–4); *medius* for *melius* (X, 141); *locuutio* for *locutio* (X, 224); *alie* for *alia* (X, 226); *Cantum* for *Cantuum* (X, 251); *accendendum* for *accedendum* (X, 284); *proemium* for *prooemium* (X, 298); *litteram* for *literam* (X, 348); *particus* for *partibus* (X, 350); *et* for *est* (X, 390); *descendere* for *descendero* (X, 418); *Ecclesiastes* for *Ecclesiasticus* (X, 421); *eo* for *ea* (X, 439); *faculta* for *facultas* (X, 605); *beatitudines* for *beatitudinis* (X, 619); in the first (as here placed) of the Battifolle letters, the colophon is omitted; in the title of the second, *Brabantis* is inserted without warrant, and *et* is omitted after *Dei*; and in the title of the third, *imperatoris* is substituted for *imperii*.

A glance at the other works reveals a similar state of things. There are seven or eight blunders in the *Quaestio*, such as *ego* for *ergo* (§ 4); *movibetur* (§ 12); *propter illos* for *propter illa* (§ 12); *de aqua et terram* (§ 12); *pratrahatur* (§ 13); *da* for *de* (§ 15); *et* for *ex* (§ 22); etc.; and in the very first chapter of the *De Monarchia* we find *facilitatem* for *felicitatem* (p. 8); and in the second *illas* for *illa* and *humanis* for *humani* (p. 10); and in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia, sibillat* for *sibilat* (p. 150); *absordum* for *absurdum* (p. 153); and so on.

It is a matter of surprise and regret that the firm of Barbèra, which in the past has numbered among the editors of this series some of the first scholars of Italy, including the illustrious name of Giosuè Carducci, should have allowed such an unscholarly piece of work to issue from their press. Especially is it regrettable that the author whose text is violated in this manner should be Dante, with whose works the name of Barbèra has been honourably associated for several generations. We trust that those responsible for the publication of this volume will take steps to retrieve the reputation of the firm by the issue at the earliest opportunity of a new edition carefully revised by a competent scholar.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.
11 *Jan.* 1918.

---

[1] The references are to the *Epistolae* as printed in the *Oxford Dante*. The anonymous editor has unfortunately abandoned the accepted numbering of the *Epistolae*, and has re-numbered them throughout, thus rendering his edition very inconvenient for the purposes of reference. He might at least have supplied a comparative table showing the relation between the old and the new numbering.

Auto da Natural Invenção. Por ANTONIO RIBEIRO CHIADO. *Obra desconhecida, com uma Explicação prévia pelo* CONDE DE SABUGOSA. Lisboa: Livraria Ferreira. 1917. 8vo. 105 pp.

The Conde de Sabugosa has laid all lovers of literature under another heavy debt. The edition of this new play from his library follows the plan of his celebrated edition of Gil Vicente's *Auto da Festa* (1906); that is, it is accompanied by a facsimile of the original sixteen-page edition and preceded by an elaborate and most interesting introduction. This hitherto unknown play was acted before King João III about the year 1550. Its author, the witty and acute Chiado (c. 1520?—1591), whose name is still remembered in that of Lisbon's Piccadilly, and whom the editor here compares and contrasts with John Skelton, was a Franciscan monk, but, finding convent ways hard and dull, he escaped to the greater freedom of a vagabond poet's life. A hundred anecdotes gathered about his name. Two of these will show the cast of his humour. A bowl of lentil soup was set before this unwilling monk. Seeing a single lentil lying in much water he began to undress rapidly, saying that he would dive for it. On another occasion, when burglars had entered his house and taken most of the furniture, he seized what he could carry of the remainder and hurried after them with the inquiry 'Where are we moving to?' Of the *Auto da Natural Invençam* the author himself, towards the end, says that it is tedious in parts, but 'discreet and natural.' Its discretion is shown in sparing us the classical allusions of which Antonio Prestes was so fond; the conversation of the *ratinho* from the country and of the *escudeiro*, those two *pièces de résistance* of Portuguese comic authors in the sixteenth century, is natural enough, and Chiado plumes himself on having no forced rhymes. But if the *lisboetas* of that day could crowd to hear so undramatic a display of disconnected scenes they must have been easily amused. For us time has given to the play an extraordinary interest. It is as if Manuel Tamayo y Baus' *Un Drama Nuevo*—like this *auto*, a play within a play—which shows us Shakespeare in person on the stage, had been written not in the nineteenth century but in the time of Shakespeare. A large company is gathered in the house of Senhor Gomez da Rocha one evening in Lisbon. The players are due to arrive at ten or at latest at eleven, but they have to play first at two other private houses. The house is crowded, in one part thirty persons are seated on chairs, others are on the floor, or overflow into the study (*estudo*) or gather about the door, which is much battered owing to the attempts of the uninvited to press in. Outside, the street is so thickly crowded that the unpunctual actors can with difficulty force a way through. At last they appear, author and players and musicians, and, after quarrels among the actors and many a hubbub, the play, for which Rocha had paid ten crusados, begins, not without interruptions from the audience. It was shorter than the play which one of the characters says he had seen in Italy, and which lasted six hours, nor was it the approach of dawn which caused the rejection of Rocha's proffered torches as the guests departed, after one of them had invited the company to witness another play at his house on the following Sunday.

The Conde de Sabugosa considers (p. 29) that Rocha belongs to the middle class, but he is clearly the Gomez da Rocha of Chiado's earlier play *Pratica de Oito Figuras*, a rich *fidalgo* who had lost a lawsuit and would thus especially relish the quips against judges in both plays, and is fond of listening to *trovas*, although, as we now learn, he is not such a devotee of the drama as to wish ever again to have a play acted in his own house, however pleasant it may be to listen to one, after a good dinner, in an armchair in the house of a friend, with thirty or at most a hundred other guests (pp. 65, 89). We are sorry to see that he has not mended his language (cf. l. 140 and *Obras do Poeta Chiado* [1889] p. 29). The *velha*, too, is an old friend or, rather, she reappears in the later *Auto das Regateiras*, and *a sua Varela* (p. 97) is evidently her daughter, lazy, well-dowered Beatriz Varela, whose wedding occurs in that *Auto* (*Obras*, p. 91). The reminiscences of Vicente are evident, here as in most of the sixteenth century *autos*. This old woman, to Beatriz more dragon than woman, comes from *Quem tem farelos?*, the rhymes *papas, trapas, solapas* (p. 87) and *confusão, concrusão* (p. 88) are from *Os Almocreves*.

The Conde de Sabugosa has transcribed the play with great care. It is perhaps a pity that he did not adhere to the original spelling even more closely. For instance the word *procoladores* (*procuradores*) is worth comparing with the *ploculador* of Prestes' *Auto do Mouro Encantado*. In ll. 240—1 the reading should surely be *cautos-autos*. The present *cantor-autor* makes no sense. In l. 261 *que figi eu?* should be given to the *ratinho*. *Mangaz* of l. 352 is the *mengaz* of the *Pratica dos Compadres*, or rather the latter should probably be spelt *mangaz*. *Cadeiras* (l. 578) should of course be *cadeira*. There seems no reason to alter the original *s'o* (l. 736) to *se*. Is it possible that the cryptic *curto* of p. 103 is connected with the Galician *curuto*? Does the audacious old woman threaten to hurl part of the roof at the squire? These and other minute points may perhaps be considered for a second edition of a work which is certain to receive a very wide welcome.

AUBREY F. G. BELL.

S. JOÃO DO ESTORIL, PORTUGAL.

Christianopolis, An Ideal State of the Seventeenth Century, translated from the Latin of Johann Valentin Andreæ with an historical Introduction. By FELIX EMIL HELD. (*Germanic Literature and Culture*: a Series of Monographs, edited by J. GOEBEL.) New York: Oxford University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1916. 8vo. xii + 287 pp.

Dr Held, who is Associate Professor of German in Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, has done good service in drawing the attention of students to Andreæ's little known Utopia, and in trying to ascertain its relation to the works of More and Campanella which preceded it and to those of Bacon and Samuel Gott (now considered to be the author of *Nova Solyma*[1]) which followed it.

Andreæ, born in 1586, studied for six years from about 1601 at the University of Tübingen where he acquired a knowledge not only of Greek, Latin and Hebrew, but of French, Spanish, Italian and English, and a considerable amount of mathematics. He now spent seven years in travel in Germany, Switzerland, France, Austria and Italy. From 1614 to 1620 he was Diakonus in Vaihingen, and before the end of the time published at Strasburg in 1619 his *Reipublicae Christianopolitanae Descriptio*, the subject of Dr Held's work. It owed its inspiration, in part at least, to the impression made upon him by the theocracy of Geneva. In his next post, that of Dekan and Spezialsuperintendent at Calw on the Nagold. he instituted various social experiments, and showed himself to be a dreamer who honestly tried to turn his dreams into realities. After losing many valued possessions at the time of the sack of Calw (1634) and four years later, he became in 1639 Hofprediger and Consistorialrat to Duke Eberhardt III at Stuttgart. Here it was his task to 'reestablish the Tübinger Stift and the Gymnasium at Stuttgart, as well as to fill the many vacant pulpits with worthy men and to provide for the support of the latter.' In his anxieties he had a firm friend in Duke August von Braunschweig-Lüneburg. About 1650 he withdrew to the Abtei of Bebenhausen, and in 1654 to that of Adelburg where he died on 27th June of the same year.

The above is abbreviated from a slight sketch of Andreæ's life given by Dr Held. Unfortunately (and this is a very serious omission) Dr Held does not give any clear account of Andreæ's various literary productions though he refers to several. There is no proper bibliography even of the work under consideration. But more than that is required, for in considering the question of its originality, it is desirable to know the form and spirit of his other writings[2] and the amount of power which they evince.

Dr Held seems rightly to lay stress on the influence exerted on Andreæ by Geneva as he saw it: and like a good editor minimizes any obligation he had to More and Campanella, while he essays to show that the *Descriptio* may have been known to Bacon and to Gott and have left traces on *New Atlantis* and *Nova Solyma*, and even, through the agency of Hartlib and Dury and others of their circle, contributed to the foundation of the Royal Society. A good deal of light is thrown on the personal relations of seventeenth century scholars and educational reformers, but Dr Held's arguments establish probabilities and possibilities rather than certainties. It does however seem probable that the *Descriptio* was known well to the group which gathered about Hartlib, possibly therefore to Milton. And when Milton in the *Areopagitica* says that 'by the general instinct of holy and devout men...God is decreeing to begin some new and great period in his church, even to the reforming of Reformation itself' he may have had in mind what Andreæ said, after telling the tale of Luther's assault on Rome, 'Hac nostrâ ætate, nescio an non actio repetatur[1].' But then Tennyson may be thought to have read Andreæ's 'Liberale ingenium nunquam alacrius est quàm cùm doctores suos habet familiares[2],' when he wrote:

---

[1] See *The Library*, July, 1910, p. 225.

[2] Hallam came across part of his *Mythologiae Christianae* (1618) translated into German in Herder's *Zerstreute Blätter*, vol. v, and was roused by it to an unusual warmth of appreciation (*Literature of Europe* III, 155).

And what delights can equal those
That stir the spirit's inner deeps
When one that loves but knows not, reaps
A truth from one that loves and knows?

Such coincidences must needs befall. To whatever extent the *Descriptio* is indebted to More or Campanella, it is an interesting work and one that came out of the author's heart. It cannot be said to show More's charming irony, Campanella's rapid narration, or Bacon's rich colouring—Andreæ is after all a Lutheran preacher, and he tends to throw in a little sermonizing at every opportunity. But he is an earnest social and educational reformer with ideas of his own. His city is governed by a triumvirate. It is well lighted at night. The citizens live in separate houses, which belong to the state, and have their meals in their homes, getting their food from the state-store. Their houses have each a bathroom. There is a temple in the city for religious services in which are acted from time to time religious plays such as the *Jeremias* of Naogeorgus. Children are handed over to the state at the age of six, and henceforth all the boys are herded together in one building and the girls in another, all under strict moral surveillance. The boys' teachers are men of position, who are kind in their methods and study the individualities of their pupils: the girls are taught similarly by the schoolmasters' wives. The schoolrooms are 'open, sunny, and happy.' Languages are learnt rapidly 'as in play' because little time is given to grammar. The mother-tongue is especially cultivated. Music and painting are prominent in the curriculum, but dancing is taboo. Astrology is studied, but in a rather sceptical spirit, and Roman law 'for something to do.' The citizens have no need of a 'corpus juris' of their own.

Andreæ's book has many interesting features, and we trust that Dr Held will give us a reprint of it. Unfortunately instead of a reprint, he has tried to give us a translation, and for this his knowledge of Latin[3] as well as his skill in the turning of Latin into English is sadly defective. His translation is generally clumsy, and very frequently incorrect. Some proofs of these statements must be given:

The dedication to Arndt is headed by Dr Held 'Thou most Noble and Worthy Man....' He ignores the preceding 'S. I. C.' (no doubt 'Salve in Christo') of his original. Andreæ ends the dedication

'R. D. T. (no doubt 'Reverendæ Dignitatis,' or 'Dominationis,' 'tuæ') Observantissimus,'

---

[1] *Ad Lectorem.*

[2] Cap. XLVII.

[3] Some light had been thrown on this at p. 53 of the Introduction where he attributes to Bacon a work *De Sapientia Veterorum.*

For this Dr Held gives 'R. D. T.
Most faithfully.'

To the Reader. p. 133. 'quoscumque vel mutire animadvertunt...haud raró invitissimos in conflictum pertrahunt'—'not rarely drag those into the conflict who merely grumble at them though they may not at all desire it.'

p. 133. 'fuisse qui rei turpitudinem tulerint, nedum ('not to say') approbarint'—'there were people who, though they may perhaps not have approved of such baseness, at least tolerated it.'

p. 133. 'avaritia quæ inter humanos errores fæneratur'—'greed which does so flourish among men.'

p. 134. 'sive rerum absurdissimarum assuefactio'—'whether people foolishly become accustomed to things.'

p. 134. 'ne modestiæ bonorum obtemperent, cui modico satis fieri posset, & tolerabili'—'lest they should conform to the modesty of the good, which can be done with moderate and tolerable means.'

p. 134. 'Ita...Lutherus noster emersit'—'It was thus that...Luther proceeded.'

p. 134. 'cum obsidionem...tulisset'—'when he had carried on siege.'

p. 134. 'cepit Hadriani molem...impugnare'—'he began to storm the opposing power.' (Does not Dr Held know 'The Shandon Bells'?—

'I've heard bells tolling
Old 'Adrian's Mole' in,
Their thunder rolling
From the Vatican.')

p. 135. 'dum religiosi...audiamus' ('if only we are reputed religious')—'though we listen like religious...men.'

p. 135. 'literaturæ monita perduellionis accusarent' (text corrected in the 'Errata')—'being warned against...letters, they were accused of treason.'

p. 136. 'eruditione invitissima' ('their sluggishness in study')—'even against the direct wishes of scholarship.'

p. 136. 'quos Reipublicæ optima conscientia & magnis meritis adesse opinio erat' ('who were thought to befriend the state conscientiously and meritoriously') 'who were thought to be well versed in the affairs of the state, and of great merit.'

p. 147. 'humanitatis legibus'—'the attractions of the flesh.'

p. 162. 'ad cotem saepe standum vel sedendum est'—'we must stand near or even sit down upon a whetstone.'

p. 169. 'brutalitatis confessionem illis exprobrant'—'against other people the former prove a confession of their...brutality.'

p. 188. 'non approbat; sed cum candore & sale carpit' ('finds fault')—'she disapproves, but she chooses with kindness and sense.'

p. 191. 'Divini Voluminis summa apud eos auctoritas est, & precium, quod (sc. 'Volumen') unum Divino munere hominibus concessum...agnoscunt'—'The highest authority among them is that...of the Divine Book; and this is the prize which they recognize as conceded by divine gift to men.'

p. 194. 'Thuanus' ('De Thou')—'Thanus.'

p. 230. (the body) 'haud raró animæ detrimento delicatiùs habitum'—'not a few times clad more delicately than damage to life warranted.'

p. 206. 'Quod Aulæ luxui & otio tribuitur, id honestæ recreationi...hic datum est, nunquam felicioribus impensis'—'Whatever is elsewhere given over to luxury and leisure of palaces, is here devoted to honorable recreation..., an investment that is nowhere more satisfying.'

p. 207. 'nisi summum...judicium & ingeniorum discrimen adhibeant'—'if they do not give evidence of the highest power of judgment...as well as a recognition of crises in the nature of their pupils.'

p. 212. 'volunt esse prolixi' ('they are inclined to be prolix')—'they desire to seem broad.'

p. 246. 'nolunt in...Pandectis, digestisve, in Canone, vel Clemente, vel Extravagante esse occupati'—'they do not wish to be bothered by...pandects or other legal digests, in canon, indulgence, or extravagance.'

Andreæ's 'Clemente' apparently = 'Clementino.' The 'Clementines' are the fourth, as the 'Extravagantes' are the fifth and last section of the *Corpus Juris Canonici.*

p. 264. 'Luxuria' is not to be translated 'Luxury' but 'Lust.'

Proof enough has been given of Dr Held's defective Latinity and clumsy English: one need only remind him of the words he puts into the mouth of poor Pastor Andreæ (p. 214): 'The Latin language must be preserved because it is in itself valuable in a good many ways.…Then it has what may reproach me, a man woefully untaught in its use, intolerant of its civilization, out of sympathy with its fastidiousness, or as it itself is wont to insist, barbarous.'

'The Latin language (one may add 'the English language') must be preserved.' What are we to say then of professed scholars of the twentieth century who are content to translate Latin in a slovenly and inaccurate style which would disgrace a Fifth Form boy, and who leave us sighing for the elegance and polish of two centuries ago? Dr Held's translation is not only inelegant, it has serious blunders on practically every page. Yet he has at least given us an impression of the contents of an interesting book which few of us had ever heard of, he has done something to set it in relation to books before and after, and to this extent he deserves our thanks.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

Heyse and his Predecessors in the Theory of the Novelle. By ROBERT McBURNEY MITCHELL. (*Ottendorfer Series of Germanic Monographs,* No. IV.) Frankfurt a.M., 1915. 8vo. 107 pp.

La Nouvelle Individualiste en Allemagne, de Goethe à Gottfried Keller. Par PAUL BASTIER. Paris, 1910. 8vo. 452 pp.

These two studies are devoted to the German 'Novelle,' that interesting literary form which, based on Romance models, particularly Boccaccio and Cervantes, came into favour at the end of the eighteenth century, was welcomed by the Romanticists and, gradually expanding in form, substance and ethical significance under the hand of later realists, has become the most successful branch of fiction cultivated in Germany. The first fifty years witnessed tentative experiments, by Goethe, Tieck, Droste-Hülshoff, Grillparzer; but the full capabilities of the new *genre* were first revealed by that unrivalled quartette, Storm, Keller, Meyer, Heyse. Their successors, Ebner-Eschenbach, Fontane, Liliencron, Viebig etc. have introduced further modifications, in spirit, treatment of milieu, characterization and in the construction not only of the 'Novellen,' but also of the frame which may be employed to contain the stories.

Bastier applies the analytic method to a considerable number of 'Novellen' from Goethe to Otto Ludwig and draws his conclusions from these. His work is careful, suggestive and full of information. Mitchell traces the growth of the idea among the critics, quoting from them, annotating their views and hinting at his own. He has a somewhat barren field to work in, and he is not too careful in his deductions. Bastier's book gives a good idea of the practice of the first fifty years, Mitchell's of the theory. Later developments are barely touched upon by Bastier, and he would have been wise to limit his conclusions to the period which his investigations covered. Mitchell's survey of the criticism is complete also only to about 1850. In the later period he considers no one fully but Heyse, Spielhagen being consigned, for no obvious reason, to footnotes. Otherwise he leaves out of account the great mass of theory and practice in the last sixty years and is extremely rash in setting up Heyse's popular but never undisputed view, first published in 1871, as the final canon of rules regarding this form. It is well to remember here the words of Keller, the great master of the 'Novelle,' written ten years later:

> Was die fragliche Materie selbst betrifft, so halte ich dafür, daß es für Roman und Novelle so wenig aprioristische Theorien und Regeln gibt als für die anderen Gattungen, sondern daß sie aus den für mustergültig anzusehenden Werken werden abgezogen, respective daß die Werke und Gebietsgrenzen erst noch abgesteckt werden müssen. Das Werden der Novelle, oder was man so nennt, ist ja immer noch im Fluß.

In its special limitations, as a study of the 'Novelle' till 1850, Bastier's book is admirable. It is only in points of detail that we would differ from him. His criticism of Heyse's theory (p. 62 f.) is largely beside the point, for Heyse was seeking principally a means of distinguishing between 'Novelle' and other forms of narrative, and to say that his canons form no basis for judging the merits of Keller is certainly true enough, but it confuses two things which are not the same, the definition of a form and the right tests of literary excellence in that form. Bastier shows how the Germans widened the range of the 'Novelle' by attaching importance to landscape and environment (*Die Judenbuche*), by a deeper psychology (*Der Prokurator*), and by the introduction of a singular personality instead of an event (*Der arme Spielmann*). But he goes too far when he says (p. 227): 'L'intérêt spécifique des nouvelles allemandes repose moins sur l'histoire contée, que sur les individus en qui elle s'incarne.' He should have remembered Heyse's words: 'Ich stehe noch auf dem veralteten Standpunkt, daß mir in jeder Geschichte die Geschichte selbst die Hauptsache ist.' When illustrating Storm's method of concentration and elimination he misses an excellent chance of a comparison between the old masters and the new. Cervantes says: 'To shorten the introduction of our narrative, and avoid everything irrelevant to our immediate entertaining history, we shall now content ourselves etc.' Storm puts it more artfully in his *Erinnerungs-Novellen*: 'I do not remember everything, only what happened, not how it happened. As my memory recalls it point by point I shall relate it to you.' For his definition Bastier founds upon Goethe's words: 'Was ist die Novelle anders als eine sich ereignete, unerhörte

Begebenheit?' This, by the way, is not much more than what Cervantes said long before, 'some singular new adventure.' Regarding this as a germ capable of expansion Bastier puts the matter in his own words: 'thème unique; unité d'intérêt; singularité et vérité de l'action; aspect historique, périmé de cette action; et enfin, sous-intendu: récit de cette action'; and with this not much fault need be found.

Mitchell's thesis is much shorter than that of Bastier, but he set himself a difficult task. The consideration of the views of men like Mundt, Wienbarg, Laube throws interesting light on the one-sided literary ideals of their day, but for the purpose of defining the 'Novelle' they are of no value whatever. Greater nonsense could not be penned than what Mundt writes about the novel. Mitchell would also have advanced more rapidly and surely if he had considered the practice as well as the theory of the writers. The remarks of Grillparzer, for example (p. 58), were not worth quoting, but a glance at the technique of *Der arme Spielmann* would have shown that he too contributed to development. The greatest fault of Mitchell's position, however, is that he pins his faith so exclusively to Heyse. 'Of the four acknowledged masters,' he says, 'of the Novelle in Germany—Theodor Storm, Paul Heyse, Gottfried Keller and Conrad Ferdinand Meyer—Heyse alone has expressed himself with any considerable fulness on the theory of this literary species.' This, to begin with, is not true. Storm has left us a full and rounded expression of his views on the 'Novelle' (quoted by Köster in the *Briefwechsel zwischen Theodor Storm und Gottfried Keller*, pp. 250–251). This *Briefwechsel* is itself a mine of information on the views both of Keller and Storm, and the biographies of the various authors with their letters, as far as published, provide material for a complete theory. And even if this were not so, why, there are the 'Novellen' themselves. Storm, in fact, is as great an innovator in the 'Novelle' as Heyse. He himself, and many after him, have pointed out that his 'Novellen' grow from a lyrical germ, that every detail in them is selected, placed in its due light and arranged so as to engender in the reader the mood in which the work was composed (see P. Schütze's *Theodor Storm*, 1911 edition, p. 298). Unity of interest is his aim. As to rules of form, he simply thrusts them aside when they do not conform to his object. Thus of his work, *Zur Chronik von Grieshuus*, he says with obvious reference to Heyse's canon:

> Den Boccaccioschen Falken lass' ich unbekümmert fliegen und verliere mich romantisch zwischen Wald und Heidekraut vergangener Zeiten.

Köster gives a different explanation of this passage:

> Der 'Falke,' den Heyse einmal in Hinblick auf Boccaccio von jeder Novelle verlangt hat, ist ein nur ihr gehöriger individueller Stoff, die Speisung mit einem Tropfen des eigenen Herzbluts, dem köstlichsten, was der Dichter opfern kann.

The passage accordingly means that Storm is not giving an experience of his own here, but merely shaping a subject derived from remote sources. This, however, is surely more than Heyse meant, and also an unlikely explanation of Storm's remark. Keller too, just as little as Storm, can be left out of any theory of the modern 'Novelle.' He is an innovator also, in the epic breadth of his narrative and in the beauty and importance of the detail. He cared little about rules of form, calling his stories 'Geschichten,' 'Novellen,' 'Erzählungen,' 'Lebensläufe,' indifferently. He was unorthodox in seeing no essential difference between 'Novelle' and 'Roman' except that of concentration. Many subjects, he thought, could be treated in the one way or the other. But with all his heterodoxy he is the greatest of them all; there is in him, as Storm says, 'ein Blühen und Rauschen,' such as none could rival, 'eine Anschauung, eine Erfahrung, das lebendige Blut.'

Many of the details of Mitchell's book stand in need of correction. On p. 5 he says, 'In his reference to the drama Lessing hints at an essential similarity of *genre*' (between 'Novelle' and drama). Lessing only says that in a definite case, *Der unglückliche Liebling*, Banks found the material in a 'Novelle' so suitable to his hand that he only required to put it into dialogue. He makes no such generalization as Mitchell implies. Numerous examples of dramas based on 'Novellen' could be adduced (Ludwig's *Das Fräulein von Scudéri*, Hauptmann's *Elga*) to show that the dramatist has to make considerable changes. All depends on the 'Novelle.' The 'Stimmungsnovelle,' particularly when the author throws a veil over events, is undramatic. The so-called 'Konfliktnovelle' comes nearer to the drama. But even here the writer's aim, method and effect are different from those of the dramatist. None of the great 'Novellisten' has excelled in drama. Bastier, too, is somewhat confused on this issue, but Camillo von Klenze puts him right in the *Journal of English and German Philology*, vol. XI, no. 1, p. 115.

On p. 20 Mitchell writes, 'Spielhagen goes further than Schlegel would venture and makes the possibility of dramatization the supreme test for the value of any Novelle-motiv.' Spielhagen does not do anything so foolish. His words are: 'Ein Novellenstoff ist fast immer zugleich dramatisch, folglich kann beinahe jede Novelle in ein Drama umgedichtet werden.' The limitations are important, and, if we read the whole paragraph in Spielhagen's *Beiträge*, p. 285, it will be seen that his words are to be taken in a very special sense.

On p. 63 Mitchell sums up Hebbel's views on characterization thus: 'From these two prefaces he would seem to have reached the conclusion that the *novelle* is quite definitely unsuited as a *genre* to character pourtrayal or at least that any detailed development or analysis of character is here out of place.' This is a false deduction. One line from the introduction to the *Novellen* (quoted by Mitchell himself) will suffice to show Hebbel's view: '[Ich bestrebte mich] den Inhalt ausschließlich in die Erfindung und Charakterzeichnung, nicht aber in Raissonement, oder gar in die Beschreibung zu legen.' The modern Novelle, moreover, has a great deal of characterization, even in Heyse. The important point is that, as Bastier neatly remarks, 'Les détails du nouvelliste n'apparaissent jamais désintéressés.' *Die Judenbuche*, *Pankraz der Schmoller*, etc. are genuine character studies extending over a lifetime, and it is the concentration of everything upon the unique central theme that makes them 'Novellen.' Spielhagen's dictum that it is characteristic of the 'Novelle,' in contrast to the novel, to give us 'fertige Charaktere,' is scarcely even a half-truth. Friedrich Mergel is never 'fertig' till he hangs himself, and it takes a twelve hours' silent interview with a lion to complete the development of Pankraz.

On p. 85 Mitchell says, 'Heyse's *Falcon* is essentially identical with Tieck's turning-point.' A little later he changes his mind (p. 105), 'Heyse's *Falcon* is only partially to be identified with Tieck's turning-point.' This interesting question of turning-point is well handled by Bastier, whose graphs are most instructive. They show that Tieck's turning-point—'von welchem aus [die Geschichte] sich unerwartet völlig umkehrt'—is a popular and successful device in the 'Novelle,' but not an essential. Storm and Keller are not particularly fond of the surprising *dénouement.* On the other hand, as regards Heyse's criterion that the Novelle should have 'eine starke Silhouette,' that one should be able to say, Where is the Falcon? if we take these catchwords in a wide sense, as we took Goethe's definition, they may be accepted as useful enough. His other test, that the content of a 'Novelle' should be capable of being summarized in a few lines, is narrow and dangerous. Georg Brandes pointed out the narrowness of Heyse's tests shortly after they were published. Mitchell takes no note of this and other criticisms, although Heyse himself did. He replied rather weakly to Brandes in the introduction to the new series of the *Novellenschatz* in 1884. Twenty years later he admitted that his standpoint was old-fashioned, but he defended it to the last.

Mitchell's book is rather badly printed. There are slips on p. 7, l. 4; p. 13, l. 19; p. 42, l. 16; p. 45, l. 13; p. 50, l. 32; p. 59, l. 16; p. 62, l. 6; p. 77, l. 11; p. 79, l. 25; p. 101, l. 32.

JOHN LEES.

ABERDEEN.

VOLUME XIII OCTOBER, 1918 NUMBER 4

THE TEXT OF 'CLEANNESS.'

IN Morris's text of the M.E. poem *Cleanness* there are a considerable number of passages which are very perplexing, owing either to scribal error, or editor's faulty transcription, or else misinterpretation by punctuation or by the Glossarial Index. Several of these difficulties have been disposed of by the *New English Dictionary*, but for many of them the Dictionary gives no help. I therefore submit to the reader's consideration a few emendations and renderings which have occurred to me as possible solutions.

l. 3. I propose to read:

Fayre formeȝ myȝt he fynde in for[þ]ering his speche.

The MS. has *forering*. Morris suggests *forbering*, but the sense of the context is against the word. We may translate ll. 1–3: 'Whoever could naturally commend purity, and enumerate the arguments that she deservingly requires, might find fair formulas in advancing (furthering, promoting) his discourse.' Cp. *William of Palerne*, l. 5397:

And touche we ferre as þis tale forþeres.

l. 30. Where Morris has *anwhere* and suggests *aywhere*, we might read *auwhere*, M.E. *awhere, owhere*, O.E. *āhwǣr*. Perhaps *u* is intended in the MS.

l. 48. The word *tuch* has probably no connexion with Eng. *tuck*, as Morris suggests. It may be an earlier and more genuine form of the word which in Scotch appears as *toush* and *tosh*: a corruption, according to one view, of O.F. *courte houche*, a dialectal variant of *courte houce*.

l. 54. The sense requires *to-com*; otherwise *to* is redundant. An O.E. *tō-cuman* occurs in Sweet's *A.S. Reader*, LXVII, and the sb. *to-cyme* (= arrival, approach) occurs. Translate ll. 53–54:

> Sent his messengers to say that they should assemble, and in becoming apparel make for his feast.

l. 69. It is unlikely that the poet, with so great a choice of alliterating words before him, intended the *sower* (= *swer* according to Morris). We might read:

'& I haf wedded a wyf,' so wer[ned] hym þe pryd,

i.e. 'So the third refused him.' Other possible readings may be preferred by the reader, e.g. *so werp* or *so weres hym* (= so defends, excuses himself).

l. 106. Morris's punctuation has impaired the rhythm and mutilated the sense of this line. In place of a comma after *me* (106) I read:

For, certeȝ, þyse ilk renkeȝ þat me renayed habbe,
& denounced me noȝt, now at þis tyme...

Though *naȝt* would be better spelling, I regard *noȝt* as an adv. = wrongly, badly; see *N.E.D.* under *naught.*

l. 148. The reader should correct *erigant* to [*h*]*erigaut,* O.F. *herigalt* = cloak.

l. 201. The MS. has *vn soundely,* which Morris in later editions regards as *vnsoundely.* Yet with this reading the reader must abuse the line in seeking a satisfactory translation. I suggest:

Ne neuer so sodenly soȝt vn (= on), *soundely to weng.*

In Northern MSS. *vn* is frequently written for *on,* and there is an instance in *Patience,* l. 240. The verb to *seek on* = pursue, follow up, occurs in M.E. and corresponds to O.E. *onsēcean.* Cp. Layamon, l. 8433:

Herigal him soȝte on mid hehaer strengþe.

Translate:

Nor ever so promptly prosecuted in order to avenge soundly.

l. 208. The form *areward,* which Morris conjectures = apostate, and *N.E.D.* = afterwards, may be relegated to Middle-English ghostwords. There is no difficulty when we recollect that in the MS. an unstressed monosyllable is frequently united to a following word. I read:

& he vnkyndly as a karle kydde a reward,

i.e. He proved ungrateful: 'He, ungratefully, showed like a churl a return (for favours).'

l. 214. *dere* should be glossed = fierce and derived from O.E. *dēor,* not *dīere.*

l. 215. The MS. has:

In þe mesure of his mode his metȝ neuer þe lasse.

Morris suggests *metȝ* = *mese,* pity. It is, in my opinion, a scribal error for *meth.* A similar error occurs in l. 1153, where we must read *tyth* for *tyȝt. Mesure & meþe* occurs as an alliterative formula at l. 247 and l. 565:

In þe mesure of his mode & meþe of his wylle.

l. 216. Read *tyþe-dool*, cp. *tithedeal, tenthdeal* of English dialect = a very small part. See *Sir Gawain*, l. 719 and *Pearl*, l. 136.

l. 222. Alliteration requires an emendation here, e.g.

> *[S]weued* (= ?sweyed) *at þe fyrst swap...*

ll. 224, 5 illustrate a use of the negative in M.E. which is rare and, so far as we know, hitherto unnoted:

> *Fylter fenden folk forty daye ȝ lencþe*
> *Er þat styngande storme stynt[e] ne myȝt.*

A similar use of the negative in *Patience* 231 has not been explained:

> *He watȝ no tytter out-tulde þat tempest ne sesed.* (? *þat þe...*)

These are by no means instances of the double negative so common in M.E., but they recall the French redundant *ne* after a comparison of inequality. Cp. *Don Quixote*, Pt. I, Cap. XXVIII:

> Quán mas agradable compañia harán estos riscos...á mi intencion...que *no* la de ningun hombre humano...?

The *ne* in *Patience* is unglossed in Gollancz's edition. Prof. Emerson recognises a difficulty and suggests that *ne* (= *nee*) is the Northern form of *nyȝ* = almost. For the above passage in *Cleanness stynten* has been proposed; but in view of other passages in the poem the suggestions for both the above are scarcely tenable. There is an instance at l. 983:

> *Ones ho bluschet to þe burȝe, but bod ho no lenger*
> *þat ho nas stadde a stiffe ston, a stalworth image.*

We have also ll. 1205–6:

> *Bot er þay at-wappe ne moȝt þe wach wyth-oute,*
> *Hiȝe skelt watȝ þe askry þe skewes an-vnder.*

We may add a passage from Caxton's *Chronicles of England* XXII, 20:

> *It was not long after that brenne ne come ageyne with a grete nauye.*

In these passages the negative occurs in a subordinate clause conveying an unequal comparison of time, and the phrase conjunctions *þat...ne, er...ne* have the function of Modern English *than*. The negatives *ne, na* occur in M.E., with the force of 'than,' and also in modern dialects; but the forms *þat...ne, ere...ne* are best referred to the present northern dialect form *nor*(*ner*) = than. This *nor*, in my opinion, has no connexion with the correlative conj. *nor* (= *ne-other*), but derives from *ne-or* (= *ne-ere*).

l. 230. I do not know what to make of *wrathed*. The *New International Dictionary* records an obsolete adv. *wrath* = sorrowfully, which if genuine would suggest a *wrathe*, v., = repent.

ll. 257, 261 have given difficulty:

> *For hit was þe forme-foster þat þe folde bred*
> *þe aþel auncetereȝ suneȝ þat Adam watȝ called*
> *To wham God hade geuen alle þat gayn were*
> *Alle þe blysse boute blame þat bodi myȝt haue*
> *& þose lykkest to þe lede þat lyued next after.*

Morris suggests *forme-fostereȝ* in apposition with *suneȝ*, and *ledeȝ* for 261. In this case, however, the poet would have written *hit wern* in l. 257, and *forme-foster* recalls *first*-father as a traditional appellation for Adam. We might read [*on*] *þe folde*: 'For it was the first father that begat on the earth the sons of the noble ancestor called Adam, to whom God had given all the pure pleasures (which) that man (*bodi*, l. 260), and those likest unto him who lived after, could have.' For *bodi* = person, cp. *cors* in l. 683.

l. 313. The word *dryuen* represents a rare use of the word *drive*, i.e. to spread out thin, used especially of paint:

> *& alle þe endentur dryuen daube with-outen.*

'(With clay), well spread over, daub the crevices.' In *N.E.D.* under *drive* 12, we find cited from Palsg. 529/2: 'Drive this playster abrode.'

l. 341. As *g* is the alliterating letter here and in l. 611 etc., we should read *god-man* or *God-man*, i.e. the mediaeval designation of civility.

l. 353. *siȝed* would be a better spelling than *seyed*.

l. 379. Read *bonk*[*es*].

l. 411. The word *aȝt-sum* (? *aȝt sum*) is glossed by Morris, variously, as = 'joyous' and (later) = 'anxious.' The word is merely 'eightsome,' O.E. *eahta sum* = one of eight, with seven others; cp. Scotch *twosome*, *foursome*, etc.

A passage which has been variously interpreted begins at l. 431:

> *Al watȝ wasted þat þer wonyed þe worlde withinne*
> *þer euer flote oþer flwe oþer on fote ȝede*
> *þat roȝly watȝ þe remnaunt þat þe rac dryueȝ*
> *þat alle gendreȝ so joyst wern joyned wyth-inne.*

The stumbling-block has consisted of the words *roȝly* of l. 433 and *þat* of l. 434. Morris writes on *roȝly*, 'Is it an error for *rwly*, sorrowful?' Skeat suggests *roȝly* = pleasant, glad, and we may then translate, '...so that the remainder whom the rack drives about were glad that all kinds, thus lodged, were assembled within.' The *N.E.D.* gives *roȝly* = roughly, approximately. The context however leads us to regard *roȝly* as adj. = rough, i.e. in dire straits, harassed; and *remnaunt* as referring not to the survivors from the flood but to the ark. Translate: 'So that the relic (from the flood) that the rack drives about, within which all kinds thus lodged were assembled together, was in dire straits.'

l. 449. *Wern* is perhaps the poet's own error, due to attraction with *crageȝ*. A similar error occurs in *Patience*, l. 343.

l. 456. The spelling *corbyal* for *corbel* is perhaps due to a Northern scribe influenced by *corbie*.

l. 550. Morris writes, 'The sense seems to require *ne* before *sytteȝ*.' With a different punctuation the *ne* is unnecessary:

> *For is no segge vnder sunne so seme of his crafteȝ.*
> *If he be sulped in synne þat sytteȝ vnclene,*
> *On spec of a spote may spede to mysse*
> *Of þe syȝte of þe souerayn þat sytteȝ so hyȝe.*

This punctuation gives a sense more in keeping with the poet's argument. In the preceding quatrain the reader is warned that he may so beslobber himself with filth as to debar him from the Vision of God:

> For there is no man under the sun so scrupulous (as God) in his works.
> If he, that endures (to be) unclean, be soiled by some sin,
> A single speck of a spot may speed to deprive (him) of the Beatific Vision.

l. 553.

> *For þat schewe me schale in þo schyre howseȝ.*

The interpretation depends on the way in which we regard *þat*. It may refer to the 'speck of a spot' which may ruin us in the sight of God (l. 551), and *schewe* is perhaps best interpreted by reference to the phrase 'the spot shows.' We might translate 'For that (spot) shall expose me in those bright mansions.' The *schyre howseȝ* is obviously a reference, not so much to the *multæ mansiones* of St John ix, 2, as to the *multae et pulchrae mansiones* which, in the formulated doctrine of the Beatific Vision, were symbolic of varying rewards.

l. 599. I think there is little difference in meaning between *drawe* and *dryȝe*:

> *He may not dryȝe to drawe a-lyt* (MS. *allyt*).

Translate: 'He may not suffer (Himself) to endure (deeds of shame, l. 597) at all' (a little). The word *draw*, by frequent association with *dree*, acquired the same meaning. Cp. *Legend of Katharine*, l. 1914: '*þat eni flesch mahe drehen & drahen.*'

l. 629. The word *cob-hous* has not been glossed:

> *He cached to his cob-hous & a calf brygneȝ.*

Morris conjectures *cov-hous* = cow-house. The word *cob* is probably the same as Eng. dialect *cub* = pent-house for cattle, cattle-shed. Cp. Du. *kub* = a wicker basket, E. Fries. *kübbing* = shed, German *koben* = pigsty, originally = hut. The earliest instance of this *cub* recorded by the *N.E.D.* is one of 1546.

l. 630. As in most printed texts since 1900, *tyrne* must become *tyrue*; the same word as *terue*.

l. 765. Morris has:

> *'I graunt,' quod þe grete God, 'graunt mercy þat oþer,'*

and in a note suggests = '*graunt mercy* [*to*] *þat oþer* (?).' A far simpler rendering would be:

> *'I graunt,' quod þe grete God; 'Graunt-mercy!' þat oþer,*

i.e. 'Gramercy!' Cp. Gower, *Confessio Amantis,* III, 317:

> *She saith 'Grant-mercy, leue sir!'*

l. 795.

> *Watȝ non autly in ouþer, for aungels hit wern.*

In a note Morris proposes that we read *þen* for *in*: 'There was none more noble than the other.' In the corrigenda he suggests *antly*[*t*], = (human) form, O.E. *andwlīta.* The *N.E.D.* refers the word to *aughtly,* so that *autly* = *aȝtly* 'estimable.' The glossing 'estimable' however calls for comment. *Autly,* like English dialect *aughtlike,* may = 'like anything (known), like aught (with which they could be compared)'; in this sense, 'estimable.' So we may translate, 'There was none in either of them describable (capable of estimation).'

l. 820. The word *sour,* which Morris unnecessarily conjectures = savour, may be glossed = leaven. Cp. Scotch *sour-cake,* Eng. dial. *sour-bread,* also *sour-leaven, sour-dough.* Lot admonishes his servants to prepare food without leaven, 'wyth no sour ne no salt.'

l. 846. If *sorȝe* be retained, we might read *ȝescande* (O.E. *giscian*) for *ȝestande.* In view however of *froþande fylþe* in l. 1721 I am inclined to read *ȝestande sore* or *sour.* Cp. Eng. dial. *saur* = dung, filth, M.E. *sour.*

l. 848. The word *brych* has given difficulty. Morris conjectures = filth (cf. Germ. [*er*]*brechen* = vomit). The *N.E.D.* suggests = transgression (O.E. *bryce* = a breaking [e.g. of commandments]). The word however might be referred to an obsolete French *briche* = a shameful situation, recorded by Hatzfeld and Darmesteter.

l. 935. By a hyphen Morris has mutilated the meaning:

> *& þay token hit as tyt, & tented hit lyttel.*

The adv. *as-tyt* = quickly, is not intended here. *tyt* is a noun = a trifle, banter, a tale. Cp. Eng. dial. *tit* = a tale, a morsel, etc., also 'to tell tits,' 'tit-bits,' 'tittle-tattle,' Icel. *tittr* = a small bird. The line may be rendered, 'And they received (the news) as a trifle (or banter) and heeded it little.' In support of this reading I may cite l. 2816 of *Cursor Mundi* which describes the same incident:

þam þoȝt it was bot in play.

l. 956. For *swe* we may read *swe*[*d*], but a form like *swe*[*led*] would be more graphic as regards the sense.

l. 958. The form *Abdama* may be an error for Mandeville's *Aldama*, Vulgate *Adama* (Admah).

l. 1038. For Morris's *spinnande* read *spumande* = spumous, O.F. **spumer*, Lat. *spumare*; see *N.E.D.* under *spume*, v.

l. 1048. We must restore *wyndowande.*

l. 1075. Morris has vitiated an instance of the poet's effective antithesis. The MS. reads:

Watȝ neuer so blysful a bour as watȝ abos þenne
Ne no schroude hous so schene as a schepon þare.

(Morris's 1st ed. has *a-schepon.*)

Morris regards *abos* as an error for *abof.* I am quite sure that here we have another instance of the indefinite article joined to a following word. Read:

Watȝ neuer so blysful a bour as watȝ a bos þenne.

bos is the English dialect *boose* = crib, upper part of a cow-stall. The form presumes an O.E. **bōs*, cp. *bōsig* = cow-stall. With this reading we have a contrast between a bower and the crib in which Christ was laid, and in l. 1076 between a furnished house and the shippon. Certainly the first instance of this word recorded in *N.E.D.* is in *Prompt. Parv.*, A.D. 1440. Similar cases, however, of words in these poems which are not met with again until the following century occur at ll. 629, 883, 1514 (*cob-hous, horyed, rok*); and we need have no diffidence in accepting the form *bos.*

l. 1124.

ȝet þe perle payres not whyle ho in pyese lasttes.

Pliny, *N.H.* Book IX, writing on the pearl, states that no fall can break the gem. It is unlikely therefore that *in pyese* means 'entire.' If the phrase is genuine, it may be interpreted in the sense that however long the pearl is worn (l. 1123), it does not deteriorate so long as it remains in [existence as a 'precious] piece' (see *Pearl*, l. 192). One is however tempted to read *in pyere,* i.e. [in use] among precious stones.

l. 1153. *tyȝt* (Morris O.E. *tihtan*) is corrected by *N.E.D.* to *tith* (= grant, O.E. *tiþian*).

l. 1234. *tuyred* is regarded by some as an error for *truyed* (aphetised form of *destruire*). The *N.E.D.* refers the word to the *tyrued* of l. 630 above. It may however be the obsolete Scotch *toir* = beat down (recorded in *New Intern. Dict.*).

l. 1261. Metre requires *stynt*[*e*].

ll. 1357–8. The MS. reads:

Thenne þis bolde Baltaȝar biþenkkes hym ones
To vouche on a vayment of his vayne g[*l*]*orie.*

No *vayment* seems to be recorded. In O.F. *vouchier* occurs in the sense = call, and *vouche on* may = call for (a display), but this signification cannot be parallelled from M.E. Perhaps we should read:

To vouchė [*a*]*n avayment of his vayne-g*[*l*]*orie,*

'To attest a display of his vain-glory.'

l. 1381. Read *wonder-wroȝt*, cp. O.E. *wundor-weorc.*

l. 1385. *pursaynt* would be a better spelling than *pursaunt*:

þe place þat plyed þe pursaunt wythinne...

Translate, 'The place which the precinct (i.e. bounding line) enclosed.' For *ply* in this sense, see M.E. *imply*, *emply* = enfold.

l. 1393. A difficult passage:

When þe terme of þe tyde watȝ to vsched of þe feste...

The reader naturally assumes with Morris that *to vsched* is an error for *tovsched*, i.e. touched, come to, approached. This gives a satisfactory translation, but the spelling *tousched* is quite exceptional. In lieu of any satisfactory explanation I make, with some diffidence, a tentative suggestion. We might read *to vsched* = *to ische*d (or ? *to-ische*d). The scribe writes *v* for *i* at l. 524, *vmbre.* The M.E. *ish*, v. is the O.F. *issir*, *eissir* = go forth, come to an issue. A noun *ish* was formerly used in Scots law = 'termination, expiry (e.g. of a lease).' Cp. the phrase 'at the ish of which term' (i.e. of time). So l. 1393 might be modernised:

When the term of the time of the feast was come to an ish.

l. 1410. *felor* or *felour* (= foliage) would be better spelling than *foler.*

l. 1414. Morris and also *N.E.D.* have accepted as genuine the MS. form *tulket*, and both refer it to O.N. *tūlka* = to speak (? hence) ? to sound. As no parallel use of the word in M.E. is given, a suggestion of Prof. Skeat's in his Glossary to *Wars of Alexander*, E.E.T.S. XLVII, seems to proffer a more acceptable account of the word: 'In MSS. we often find *kk* written more like *lk*, the double letter being denoted only by doubling the down stroke. Hence we may correct *tulket* to *tukket* in the Glossary to *Allit. Poems*, which is incorrect.' Thus *tukket* = tucked, i.e. sounded the tuck of drum.

l. 1463. The word *apert* I prefer to gloss = skilfully (O.F. *aperti*, pp.), rather than = open view.

l. 1469. MS. *sardiners*, generally regarded as genuine, is perhaps an error for *sardineȝ* (= ? sardines or sardinex).

l. 1470. *alabaunderrynes* is unique, and is due to a form like Mandeville's *alabrandines* (c. XXIII, Account of the Palace of the Great Cham of Cathay). It is doubtful whether we should regard *amarraunȝ* as genuine, though *N.E.D.* accepts it. The other occurrence in M.E., *emerant*, may be a scribe's or editor's error. *amaffised* seems due to a scribe copying through dictation.

l. 1472 contains forms we should treat with suspicion:

> *Penitotes & pynkardines, ay perles bitwene.*

The *N.E.D.* accepts *penitot* from this single passage. *peritot* is the older form of *peridot.* A form *pelidot* occurs occasionally in *O.F.*, but there is no trace of a *penitot*, which here I regard as an error for *per-*. In this case *per-* seems to give the alliterating letters, and suggests a form like *pyrkarndines* (?? *pyr-karndines*):

> *Peritotes & pyrkarndines, ay perles bitwene.*

l. 1483. Considerations of metre and alliteration suggest that a word has been omitted, e.g.:

> *Of mony kyndes* [*colored*], *of fele-kyn hues.*

Also in l. 1516:

> *& þenne arn dressed* [*dere*], *dukeȝ & prynces.*

l. 1514. The word *rok* is, I am sure, the same word as English and Scotch dialects *ruck* = crowd (? cp. Swed. *ruka* = a little heap):

> *Quen renkkes in þat ryche rok rennen hit to cache.*

The only objection to this suggestion is that the word, in the sense = a crowd, is not recorded until the sixteenth century. It is for a similar reason that scholars have hesitated in regarding *horyed* of l. 883 as = hurried. See note on the word *bos* above, l. 1075.

l. 1520. I propose to read:

> *As vchon hade hym in-helde, he haled of þe cuppe.*

Morris and *N.E.D.* read *in helde.* The *N.E.D.* treats *helde* as a sb. = inclination, i.e. 'As each one had the inclination.' In English dialect however *hield*, sb. = a pouring out, and the vb. *hield, heald* = to pour out (liquor). The verb *inhelde, inhielde,* occurs once in Chaucer (see *N.E.D.*; MSS. have *in hielde*, etc.):

> *Ye in my nakede herte sentement inhelde.*

I translate: 'As each one had (liquor) poured out for him, he tossed off the cup.'

l. 1525. *gaulez* must = 'wretches':

> *Alle þe goude golden goddes þe gaulez ȝet neuenen.*

Compare (cited in *N.E.D.* under *tone*):

> *The cryis & evill-tonyt sanges of þe gaules.*
> (Livy, *S.T.S.*, II, 208.)

l. 1527. *heryed* would be a better spelling than *heyred*, though *y* may denote vowel-length.

l. 1543. For *ryth* the *N.E.D.* reads *ryther.*

l. 1566. Read *make*[*s*].

l. 1584. *hyȝed* would be a better spelling than *heȝed.*

l. 1634. For *tede* the *N.E.D.* suggests = 'tied, joined': ? read *t*[*yȝ*]*ede*, or *tede* as a Northern form. But why not refer the word to O.E. *tēon* = display?

l. 1686. *ouer-syȝed* would be a better spelling than *ouer-seyed.*

l. 1697. I suggest:

> *þat were croked and kene as þe kyte paume.*

[MS. has *panne* or *paune*, or ? *pauue.*]

The word *paume* is used for 'a claw' in Lydgate, *De Guil. Pilgrimage*, l. 17480:

> *...handys of merveyllous fasoun, lyk the pawmys off a gryffoun.*

l. 1735. Read *fayth-dedes*, cp. *fayth-wordes*, *Destr. Troy*, l. 240.

l. 1747. The MS. has:

> *þe comynes alof called...*,

and Morris queries ? *aloft.* We must read *a lof called*, i.e. 'shouted acclamation.'

l. 1776. We might read:

> *Asscaped ouer þe skyre watteres & sca*[*l*]*ed þe walles.*

(MS. and Morris have *scaþed.*) The phrase *skayles þe wallis* occurs in *Morte Arthur*, l. 3034, this being the first recorded instance of the word in such a context (c. 1400). In a figurative sense = 'mount' (into heaven), the word is found c. 1380 in Wycliffe, *Select Works*, II, 6.

HARTLEY BATESON.

CORK.

THE DATE OF 'LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST[1].'

II. The Russian Masquerade.

Apparently the Muscovite masque is a piece of extraneous amusement without immediate regard to the main play. Consequently its casual introduction has been accounted for by imagining that it owed its occurrence to some historic circumstance or other which gave it topical point. Sir Sidney Lee has suggested that it owes its introduction to a Russian mission to Queen Elizabeth in 1583 to seek a wife in her court for Ivan the Terrible. But the suggestion does not carry conviction. The parallel is much too slight and the reference too remote in time. We suggest, however, that other events explain the introduction of the masque.

Hakluyt shows us that the years 1590—1592 were very remarkable for the special interest then taken in Russian affairs; not only were the English and Russian governments in close communication, but the English court, indeed Elizabeth herself, was involved in 1591 in a dispute with the Czar, and moreover, in a dispute which, we believe, lends itself especially to the underlying theme of *L. L. L.* Moreover, this interest in Russia was explicitly represented by the publication in 1591 of Giles Fletcher's *Of the Russe Commonwealth*, with which book, as we shall see, Shakespeare has been thought to have had some acquaintance.

Hakluyt's documents show that in 1590—1592, there was much diplomatic traffic between England and Russia, mainly concerning trade problems. English merchants protested strongly against the hindrances and taxes to which the Russians submitted them; one Antony Marsh had been seized; the money of one Wm. Turnbull, deceased, was wanted by English creditors and was kept back by the Russians; Elizabeth's envoy, Jerome Horsey[2], had proved himself *persona non grata* at the Russian court, etc., etc. So Hakluyt gives us the diplomatic correspondence: Boris Pheodorowich writes to Burghley (1590); Elizabeth writes to the Czar and also to Pheodorowich (1591); Burghley writes to Pheodorowich (1591); the Czar writes to Elizabeth (1592); Pheodorowich writes to her and also to Burghley (1592). Russian affairs were clearly then of some public moment. Moreover, the English regarded themselves as offended, and therefore free to make fun of the obnoxious Muscovite. Further still, one element of the dispute affected the Queen herself, and at the same time revealed a ludicrous characteristic of Russian official life, a love of verbal pomposity, which is, so to speak, the official counterpart of those literary affectations which are the main theme of the play.

---

[1] Continued from p. 266.

[2] In III, i, 22 'A message well sympathised; a horse to be ambassador for an ass,' the horse is most unaccountably dragged into the wit. Commentators generally note the unintelligible introduction—and confess their inability to see the application. I suggest that Jerome Horsey has something to do with it—but am unable to carry the suggestion further.

The Russian Emperor, Fletcher informs us, had inordinate pride in the pompous style of his title. Everyone having audience or writing to him, must address him:

> Theodore Ivanowich, by the grace of God great Lord and Emperour of all Russia, great Duke of Volodomer, Mosco, and Novogrod, King of Cazan, King of Astracan, Lord of Plesco, and great Duke of Smolensco, of Twerrio, Joughoria, Permia, Vadska, Bulghoria, and others, Lord and great Duke of Novogrod of the Low countrey, of Chernigo, Rezan, Polotskoy, Rostove, Yaruslavely, Bealozera, Liefland, Oudoria, Obdorca, and Condensa, Commander of all Liberia, and of the North parts, and Lord of many other Countries, &c. (*Russe Commonwealth*, p. 235 in Hakluyt, vol. IV, 1886).

And Fletcher goes on:

> My selfe when I had audience of the Emperour, thought good to salute him only with thus much, viz. Emperour of all Russia, great Duke of Volodomer, Mosco, and Novogrod, King of Cazan, King of Astracan. The rest I omitted of purpose, because I knew they gloried, to have their stile appeare to be of a larger volume then the Queenes of England. But this was taken in so ill part, that the Chancelour...with a loude chafing voice, called still upon me to say out the rest. Whereto I answered, that the Emperors stile was very long, and could not so well be remembered by strangers, that I had repeated so much of it, as might shew that I gave honour to the rest, &c. But all would not serve till I commanded my interpreter to say it all out.

And precisely in 1591, Queen Elizabeth herself had to apologise for a similar offence to the pompous Emperor, which she did with fine satire in the following letter:

> Elizabeth by the grace of God Queene of England, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, &c. to the right high, mighty and right noble prince Theodore Ivanovich, great Lord, King, and great Duke of all Russia, Volodemer, Mosco, Novogrod, King of Cazan, and Astracan, Lord of Vobsko, and great Duke of Smolensko, Otver, Vghory, Perme, Viatski, Bolgory, and other places: Lord and great Duke of Novogrod in the low countrey, of Chernigo, Rezan, Polotsky, Rostove, Yeraslave, Bealozero, and Lifland, of Oudorsky, Obdorsky, Condinsky, and commander of all Iversky, Grisinsky, Emperor of Kabardinsky, and of the country of Charkasky, and of the country of Gorsky, and Lord of many other countreys, our most deare and loving Brother, greeting....As touching your Majesties conceit of the brevitie which we used in the setting downe of your Majesties stile and titles of honour: as nothing is further from us, then to abridge so great and mighty a Prince of the honour due unto him...so shall we need no further nor surer argument to cleare us of the suspicion of the detracting from your Majesty any part of your just and princely honor and greatnesse, then the consideration of our owne stile, which is thus contracted, videlicet, Elizabeth by the grace of God Queene of England, France, and

> Ireland, defender of the faith, &c. which kingdomes and dominions of ours are expressed by these generall words, videlicet, England, France, and Ireland: in every of which there are severall principalities, dukedomes, earledomes, provinces and countreys: which being severally expressed would enlarge much our stile, and make it of great length: which by our progenitours hath not bene used: notwithstanding, we thinke it no dishonour to us, compendiously to abridge the same in all our writings and letters written to what Prince, King, or Potentate soever. Whereupon we inferre, that holding your Majesties generall stile, we offer your Highnesse no dishonour in not expressing all the particular provinces: albeit we can willingly content our selfe, upon the knowledge of your usages and customes, to observe that course, which your selfe shall thinke most honourable...From our royall Palace of Whitehall the 14 of January, anno Domini, 1591.

Undoubtedly these circumstances became common knowledge—it could hardly be otherwise at a time when people were so much interested in Russia, and moreover, by 1598 Hakluyt had acquired the original documents of the correspondence. They would account for a desire to quiz the Muscovite: and moreover, in a play which had a main eye on the court, they would give special relish, and to some extent, dramatic propriety, to a masquerade in which the spruce affectations of the King, Biron, etc. for the moment took on a Muscovite garb, to be even more ludicrously put to shame. So it seems to us that in 1591–2 the Russian masque has a special point, and moreover the only sort of point which makes it something more than a piece of extraneous and elementary fooling.

III. CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL ALLUSIONS.

(*a*) *The dancing horse* (I, ii, 51). As this horse was skilled in arithmetic, it has been taken by all editors to refer to the celebrated Marocco. Despite confusions in the mass of literature devoted to this prodigy, it is clear that there is no record of its performances before 1591.

(*b*) *The fantastical Monarcho* (IV, i, 97). As this person was dead in 1580, the mere survival of his memory will help us little.

(*c*) *The plague* (V, ii, 419 etc.). The years 1592—1593 mark one of the severest visitations of the plague in the whole of Elizabeth's reign. It had started its ravages in August 1592; in September it caused great concern, the theatres were closed till December 29th, the law terms were removed from town both in 1592 and in 1593; it attained its severest violence in June and July 1593, and although it still raged in the following winter, it fell off in the early months of 1594. Most editors of *L. L. L.* do not regard the allusions in question as referring to this outbreak, because their preconceived notion of 1590 as the date of the play prevents their doing so. But we have two very strong reasons for thinking that such is the reference. (i) 'There is reason to think that the plague was almost or altogether absent from London for the...nine years [1583—1592][1]': and 1582 is too remote for casual topical allusions. (ii) As Hart has pointed out, the particular terms of one of the references—*The Lord have mercy on us*—seems to put the question beyond doubt. The phrase occurs three times in those writings of Nashe which were written during 1592—1593, and as Dr McKerrow, by omitting to make a note on it, seems to be doubtful of the reference, the question will bear fuller treatment. Hart's references to Dekker make it clear that the phrase was used as some sort of inscription in connection with the plague, and his quotation from R(oger) S(harpe)'s *More Fools Yet* (1610)—

> A doore belonging to a house infected,
> Whereon was plac'd (as tis the custom still)
> *The Lord have mercy on us*: this sad bill
> The sot perus'd—

specifies the use clearly. He finds the phrase twice in Nashe's writings of the plague years, but can discover no earlier reference: he therefore assumes that the inscription is to be associated with the 1592—1593 outbreak. We find in *Summer's Last Will* [McKerrow, vol. III, p. 283] written probably in the autumn of 1592:

> The plague full swift goes bye; I am sick, I must dye:
> Lord, have mercy on us;

and in *The Unfortunate Traveller* [*ibid.* vol. II, p. 268] written probably in 1593:

> Whilest I was in Rome...So it fel out that it being a vehement hot summer...there entered such a hotspurd plague...it was but a word and a blowe, Lord have mercie upon us, and he was gone.

It may be objected to the first of these that the phrase is the refrain of a 'doleful ditty' which is only specifically associated with the plague in this stanza: but as the plague was the cause of the majority of deaths, a specific prayer associated with it might easily serve as applicable to death generally; moreover it would seem that this specific invocation is preferably explained by the suggestion of a topical occasion: the one we should expect to arise out of normal scriptural and liturgical suggestion is the one we actually get as refrain to a later song of the same play: 'From winter, plague, and pestilence, good Lord, deliver us' (*ibid.* p. 292). At all events, it seems to us that Hart's two references settle the question. And we have confirmatory evidence to offer. In the one book of Nashe's which is really concerned with the plague, *Christ's Teares*, 1593, we find the phrase in a somewhat exceptional form:

> At this instant is a generall plague disperst throughout our Land. No voyce is hearde in our streetes, but that of Jeremy...etc.

---

[1] Creighton, *A History of Epidemics in Britain*, p. 345.

He goes on to quote from Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Matthew: then, we read:

> With the two blinde men that satte by the High-way side when Christ came from Jericho, we have cryed a long time, *Lord, have mercy upon us, Lord, have mercy upon us, O Sonne of David, have mercie upon us* (*ibid.* vol. II, p. 157).

As Dr McKerrow points out, Nashe is often inexact in his Biblical quotations and it is not easy to determine which version he quotes from. In this instance however, one notes that Nashe gives the wrong reference (Matth. xxi, 19 for xxi, 30), and that he twice repeats the phrase at issue, as if it arose spontaneously to the occasion. We agree, then, with Hart that the phrase bears an explicit reference to a plague custom, and as we also have been unable to trace it in earlier visitations, we agree also that it refers to the 1592—3 outbreak.

But Hart is tied to 1590 as the date of the play: he therefore supposes these references to have been added in a revision of the play about 1594. We cannot accept the inference. The allusions lend themselves easily to the date for which we are arguing: and there are specific reasons in addition against Hart's supposition. There is not a jot of evidence in favour of a revision in 1593–94: on the contrary, as we shall see, there is much against it. Further we suggest that allusions such as we have them in the play would be out of place in 1593—4. The plague broke out in the summer of 1592: it killed 2000 people before the end of the winter and attained its greatest intensity in the summer of 1593: in that year there were some 15,000 deaths from it 'in and about London.' Shakespeare's allusions to it are jocular; Nashe's are earnest, and, if there is any which has a tinge of levity in its setting, it is the 1592 one. Indeed the unprecedented mortality of 1593 would take the edge off any casually frolicsome reference to the terrible scourge in 1593 and in 1594: and we should imagine that such a reference could only have been inserted just after the plague started—sometime in the early autumn of 1592[1].

(*d*) *The Hunting scene* (IV, i, IV, ii, 1—57). Hart observes that Shakespeare seems to be reproving a particularly unsportsman-like sort of murder, which does not allow the deer 'fair law.' We may well imagine that Shakespeare the countryman would feel the nauseousness of the courtly fashion of hunting. In 1591 Thomas Scarlet printed *The Queen's Entertainment at Cowdray* [*in* 1591] and gave a sickening picture of the royal sport:

---

[1] Amongst these allusions to contemporary incidents in the life of the Elizabethan, one may note that a specific dance, 'the canaries,' is mentioned in *L. L. L.*: the first definitely datable reference to it in England is in Nashe's *Pierce Pennilesse* (McKerrow, I, 173) 1592. The possibility that the dance may have been newly introduced in 1592 is to some extent strengthened by the association of it in Nashe with the proud finical Mistress Minx, the merchant's wife. At all events we do not hear of the dance before 1592, unless *L. L. L.* is before that date.

> Mundaie, August 17...her Highnes [had]...a crossebowe delivered to her hands to shoote at the deere, about some thirtie in number, put into a *paddocke*, of which number she killed three or four, and the countess of Kildare one.

Further still (also noted by Hart) Frederick, Duke of Wurtemberg, was sumptuously entertained at Windsor in 1592 with the same revelry in mere slaughter. The Princess's remarks in *L. L. L.* would gain special point by supposing them to have been uttered in 1592 when the Cowdray 'sport' was published to the world and when a royal personage was being treated, or had just been treated, to the same amusement. It may be objected that Shakespeare would hardly attack a form of 'sport' just at the time when the court was countenancing it. But in this very play, he does not hesitate to mock other affectations of the court.

Furnivall (and Hart) regard these hunting incidents as insertions when the play was revised—and once more, for no tangible reason except the pre-conception that the first draft was as early as 1590. But we regard them as clearly of the first draft. In the first place, if Shakespeare is protesting against the court usage, we may imagine that his sense of the nauseousness of the indiscriminate slaughter would be stronger, the nearer the incidents were to his Stratford days. And secondly, we regard the insertion of the hunting incidents—apparently so casual—as occasioned by the choice of Navarre as hero, and therefore inserted as soon as that choice was made, i.e. after the writing of the first few scenes. Navarre was a keen huntsman: he was often reproached for neglecting state affairs through his fondness for the sport: at least that is what we gather from his celebrated saying to Sir Ralph Winwood—'Some say I am a hunter, others that I make love, but I wake when they sleepe'[1]. As we have seen, Elizabeth, on one occasion during the war, sent him her hunting trophies as a present.

IV. ALLUSIONS TO BOOKS.

There are in *L. L. L.* only three unmistakable references to other books, as distinct from echoes of stylistic peculiarities, although by its very nature we should expect it to contain many. Only one of these references allows a decisive inference as to the limits of the date of the play, although there is one feature in common in the other two references, which, in our opinion, makes them equally convincing.

---

[1] *Memorials of State*, vol. IV, p. 409 (quoted by Black).

(*a*) As we have mentioned, 'The first and second cause' (I, ii, 183) is undoubtedly an allusion to Sir William Segar's (?) *Booke of Honor and Armes* (1590). Hence the play is not before 1590.

(*b*) Holofernes' Italian proverb *Venetia, Venetia, Chi non*, etc. is to be found in Florio's *First Fruites* 1578. Costard's parody of the arms of Alexander 'Your lion, that holds his poll-axe sitting on a close-stool' (V, ii, 577 etc.) refers to the mythical heraldry of Legh's *Accedens of Armorye*, first published in 1562. But both these books had been brought before the public eye once more by a re-publication in 1591. It seems reasonable to suppose that the new issues had caught Shakespeare's eye. The particular nature of his reference to Legh would seem to confirm this. We know that the book was very popular and reached its sixth (or seventh) edition in 1612. But Shakespeare does not, so far as we can trace, show any knowledge of it except in this passage, although he frequently displays his heraldic interests. He was at all events not familiar with the book. But the reference in this play is not a merely casual nor a vague one: it gives a point to point parody of one detail. It would seem that at the moment Shakespeare had the book under his eyes. We may suppose, then, that some circumstance had made the book of easy access to him for the moment and for the moment only. And that circumstance was probably the publication of the 1591 edition and the consequent display of it by the stationers. Of course, any chance may have thrown an older edition under his eyes at any moment; but the chain of circumstance which makes it likely that the particular chance was the publication of the 1591 edition seems strengthened by the fact that, so far as we have been able to trace, the last previous edition of Legh had appeared as far back as 1576.

It seems, then, that these references give us not before 1591 as the date of the play.

(*c*) Sir Sidney Lee, in the article frequently alluded to in this paper, suggested that Fletcher's book *Of the Russe Commonwealth* (1591) prompted Shakespeare to the introduction of his Russian masquerade: although, of course, we must again add that to accommodate circumstances with the notion of 1590 as the date of the play, Sir Sidney thought that Shakespeare could only have seen the book in MS. He alleged two passages in which Shakespeare seemed to be echoing Fletcher:

(i) V, ii, 268, Rosaline's 'Well-liking wits they have; gross, gross, fat, fat'; and Fletcher's 'they are for the most part of a large size and of very fleshly bodies, accounting it grace to be somewhat gross and burly.'

(ii) V, ii, 206. Rosaline's reference to 'their rough carriage so ridiculous,' and Fletcher's 'for the most part they are unwieldy and inactive withal.'

The former of these alleged echoes, however, amounts to little. Rosaline describes the wit, Fletcher, the body. And moreover Russians were proverbially fat; Gascoigne tells Parker

> The Russie men are round of bodies, fully fac'd,
> The greatest part with bellies bigge that overhang the waste.

The second, however, may have some weight, because the Russians had not a reputation for 'rough carriage'; on the contrary, Gascoigne remarks that, despite their fatness, 'their gate is very brave.'

V. VERBAL AND STYLISTIC ECHOES.

Hart has pointed out many instances where Shakespeare, appropriately in a play of the literary nature of *L. L. L.*, seems deliberately to echo verbal and stylistic peculiarities of Lodge's *Rosalynde* (1590), Sidney's *Arcadia* (printed 1590), and Puttenham's *Arte of English Poesie* (1589). Of course, if these echoes are accepted, an argument based on them cuts both ways, when it is not demonstrably certain which is the original, which the echo. But the fact that in the three authors quoted, the phrase is, so to speak, used *bona fide*, whilst in the play it has generally an implied satiric or burlesque tendency, would seem to justify our regarding the latter as the echo. Such echoes in a play acted on the public stage would have greater moment when the works echoed had had time to be generally known. *Rosalynde* and *Arcadia* would certainly be well known by 1592; and perhaps Puttenham's year's start would by then have allowed his less attractive book to catch them up in popularity.

VI. POSSIBLE ALLUSIONS TO THE HARVEY-NASHE QUARRELS.

Hart has collected various odd words and phrases from the play which in his opinion are best regarded as echoes of this quarrel. Circumstances give an *a priori* likelihood to this possibility. The quarrel broke out in the autumn of 1592, Nashe's *Pierce Pennilesse* (probably between July and September 1592) taking up Greene's insufficient answer to Richard Harvey and giving 'an example of how he could rail.' G. Harvey's *Four Letters* (written September, probably published December 1592) contain his reply to Nashe, who replied immediately (January 1593) with his *Strange News*. Harvey retaliated with *Pierce's Supererogation* dated April 27, 1593, but known only in an edition which has a prefatory letter dated July 16, 1593, stating that at that time *Pierce's*

Supererogation was almost printed: Dr McKerrow, however, thinks it was not published till October 1593. And so the quarrel grew hotter and hotter: it became the literary 'event' of 1593. *Love's Labour's Lost* is a topical play: one or more of its characters are typical pedants, in the pillory for their pedantry: moreover, the dramatist seems to be specially picking out personal peculiarities from the figures of his day. From the autumn of 1592 and through 1593 the most striking literary incident of the town was a quarrel in which one party was the most striking figure of literary Bohemia and the other a man universally regarded as the type of a pedant. It seems clear that if the play was written (or thoroughly revised) at the end of 1592 or in 1593—it would inevitably contain clear allusions to the Harvey-Nashe quarrel.

Yet it does not do so. For the greater part Hart's suggested allusions seem merely ordinary coincidences. But one or two of his suggestions seem relevant.

(*a*) In IV, ii, 89 we have *Of piercing a hogshead* (or in its Q. and F. form *Of persing a hogshead*). The substance of the expression arises quite naturally out of the context. *Person* has led to the pun *pers-on* (i.e. *pierce one*): as 'piercing' was the technical term for broaching a cask, this suggests 'piercing him that is likest a hogshead': but hogshead is a term applied to a blockhead, hence Costard's impudence must be parried. And Holofernes parries it by pretending to enjoy the wit of it, repeating the phrase and adding a patronising commendation—'a good lustre of conceit in a turf of earth! fire enough for a flint, pearl enough for a swine! tis pretty! it is well.' The sequence is so natural then, that we cannot believe, as Hart believes, that the passage was written to incorporate an extraneous allusion. Nevertheless Hart points out one oddity in the phrase which does need explanation. Holofernes does not simply say 'piercing a hogshead!': he says '*Of* piercing a hogshead!' The *of* is strange and apparently out of place. The Cambridge editors accounted for the strangeness by suggesting that the *of* crept in from the speech allocation *Holof*: but that cannot be so; the speech allocation always takes the form of *Holo.* simply, and moreover, as Hart notes, in the Q. and F. this speech is wrongly allotted to Nathaniel. Hart accounts for the insertion by supposing it to be a deliberate device for drawing attention to the phrase; and we agree. He supposes that the phrase was so marked out because it had reference to a detail of the Harvey-Nashe quarrel. 'Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse* appeared in 1592. In Gabriel Harvey's reply to it, *Pierce's Supererogation*, 1592—3 [but see McKerrow's dating above] the following passage occurs: "She knew what she said that intituled Pierce the hoggeshead of witt, Peniles the tosspot of eloquence...she it is that must brooch the barrell of thy frisking conceite... ."' We are not quite convinced. But when we remember that after *Pierce Penilesse* had been published (autumn 1592), *Pierce* had been a constant reference in Harvey's *Four Letters* (December 1592), Nashe's *Strange News* (January 1593) and Harvey's *Pierce's Supererogation* (? autumn 1593), we should expect that even as early as the spring of 1593, the occurrence of 'pierce' (the verb) would suggest the notorious Pierce and give occasion for an allusion. Moreover, Nashe's preface to *Strange News* in January 1593 starts off with a lengthy railing at Harvey for drunkenness: 'Small beere' is his special enemy, he is a 'pottle-pot,' he 'falls a drinking to keep him from idlenesse' and so on until Nashe's very jests 'begin alreadie to smell of the caske, with talking so much of this liquid provinder.' So 'piercing a hogshead' may very well have reminded men of the Harvey-Nashe quarrel either in the spring of 1593 or, as Hart argued, in the autumn of 1593. But, as we have stated, we do not believe any such reference was originally intended.

What seems to us the most satisfactory explanation of all the facts concerned is that the play was written before the quarrel was of any moment (as we have suggested, autumn 1592); at its performance—which in all likelihood was postponed owing to the closing of the theatres (September to December 1592), the phrase in question reminded the actors of the quarrel—as it might easily do, as we have seen, soon after January 1593, perhaps indeed before that, or, if we regard Hart's citation as necessary, at the latest in the autumn of 1593; so the actors saw the opportunity for a further topical allusion, and specially pointed it by the insertion of *of*. In that way the *of* would find its way into the original MS. and into the Q.

(*b*) Of Hart's other supposed 'echoes,' only two seem even plausible: and these do not carry conviction. In IV, ii, 95 Holofernes praises Mantuan and quotes the line *Fauste precor* etc. In the *Four Letters*, Harvey rails at Nashe's 'Grammar Schoole witte (for his margine is as deeplie learned as *Fauste precor gelida*) etc.'; and in *Strange News*, Nashe retaliates 'he...verdits Pierce Pennilesse for a Grammar School wit: saies his Margine is as deeplie learned as *Fauste precor gellida*' etc. The line was thus classified in a piquant fashion as a type of pedant learning; and it would be attractive to imagine that that gives point to its attachment to Holofernes. But Mantuan was a popular school-book; moreover, this line is the first line of the first eclogue: and hence it might well be chosen as a characteristic 'tag' in the mouth of a schoolmaster. We have no reason whatever for thinking that Harvey's use of it occasioned Shakespeare's: Shakespeare used it for precisely the same reason as did Harvey—it was the easy sign of a schoolmaster's elementary learning.

Again, the fooling with the *l'envoy* (III, i, 73 etc.) is thought by Hart to be a gird at Harvey's fondness for *envoys*: but 'the striking parallelism' between the themes of Harvey's *envoy*, 'Virtue, Fame, Wealth, and finally...the fourth A good tongue' and the fox, the ape and the humble bee, with the goose for 'the good tongue,' in Shakespeare's *envoy* seems to us the very ecstasy of criticism, although one would fain believe that when the play was written this apparently fatuous fooling had some salt which now escapes us.

We think, then, that there is only one discoverable reference to the Harvey-Nashe quarrel in *L. L. L.*: that that reference was not originally intended: that in itself it is best explained as the addition of an actor (or of the dramatist, of course) just as the play was being staged: that the absence of other references confirms the supposition of the origin of this one: and that it implies that *L. L. L.* was written not later than the autumn of 1592.

VII. STYLISTIC SIMILARITY WITH OTHER OF SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS.

Sarrazin (*Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XXIX–XXXII) in his endeavours to establish 1593 as the date of the play on this type of evidence alone, gives an exhaustive list of more or less relevant parallels between the phraseology of *L.L.L.*, *Richard II*, and *Lucrece*, with the implication that these must have been running through Shakespeare's mind at the same time. Whatever there may be of value in this argument, would be as cogent for 1592 as for 1593.

We have now been through all the material which we have to offer, or which has been offered by different editors in support of the particular dates they have suggested. We believe that our theory gives a harmony to all of it which has hitherto been lacking. Moreover, it should be pointed out that the evidence we have given, whether the conclusions drawn from it be accepted or not, has not to be weighed over against disturbing evidence of the same objective kind, because such does not exist. It seems to us, then, that if much of our evidence in detail is not absolutely convincing, but yet gives us a series of probabilities, that quality of it should cause it, in view of the absence of contradictory evidence, to be tentatively accepted as a suitable hypothesis until it should be revised or confirmed by future discoveries. Further, as we have noted, the only arguments for a date before 1592 are purely aesthetic and thus entirely subjective, or metrical and thus partly subjective. We suggest that concrete metrical tests are not against 1592. In the first place, these tests in themselves merely suggest chronological sequence, not precise dates: and that sequence would be little disturbed by allotting *L. L. L.* to 1592. Moreover, just as special allowances in dealing with a play like *A Midsummer Night's Dream* have to be made in view of the nature of the play itself, before merely numerical results of metrical tests can become the basis of a chronological argument, so especially in *L. L. L.* The greater proportion of rhymes, etc. in *M. N. D.* would in itself establish a wrong position for the play in a chronological sequence, unless it were corrected by a consideration of the particular dramatic qualities of the play. So the greater variety of verse-forms etc. in *L. L. L.*, the main theme of which is a linguistic and stylistic one, has sufficient dramatic occasion to justify an accommodation of the numerical tests.

There remains but one question. To what extent may any material we have used as date-evidence be rendered invalid by the likelihood of its insertion in the revision of the play? In the course of this paper, where occasion seemed to require it, we have given reasons for supposing that several of the specific details referred to were not added during revision, but belonged to the original draft: for instance, the substitution of the French names, the plague references, and the hunting incidents. We believe that a general examination of the nature of the revision will lead us to suppose that very little indeed can have been added to the original draft.

There is no doubt that the play was revised: we have the explicit evidence of the Q. title page and we have clear signs of the revision in the retention in the text of original and revised renditions of the same material. Editors have thus had free scope for liberal ascriptions to this revision. Sir Sidney Lee believed that the French names and a thorough reshaping of Biron's part were due to it: Furnivall ascribed the hunting incidents and others to it: and Spedding thought the play was almost entirely recast.

These critics have assumed that the revision was not long before 1598: but Hart assumes a revision with the addition of the plague references, the Russian masquerade, etc. in 1593—4. The Quarto title page 'As it was presented before her Highnes this last Christmas.

Newly corrected and augmented,' points to a revision immediately before the publication and for the express performance before the Queen[1].

Further we may take the only definite pieces of information about the revision contained in the play itself. They are, of course, mainly in Biron's speech in IV, iii, and in the revised Biron-Rosaline compact of IV, ii. Biron's speech (IV, iii) is the one passage of the play which stands out in its import and poetry above the rest: it is the striking declamation and the speech above all others which would be chosen for touching up in a casual revision. The relatively disproportionate length of it, too, seems to mark it out as having received peculiar attention. From the duplicated parts of it we may easily see that the revision was mainly a matter of verbal rearrangement. Further, the revised compact of V, ii, offers similar evidence. The revision is small in bulk; but the revised portions are of an import which somewhat incongruously lifts the conception of the play from that of farce into the realm of philosophic comedy. They mark a comic idea Shakespeare was growing to in 1598, and which he expresses in his later comedies: but that idea is in the main alien from the whole spirit of *L. L. L.*

These alterations, then, would lead us to think that Shakespeare touched up the play before its performance at Whitehall, but did so in a desultory fashion: he found the play of a type he had outgrown, and merely gave it the stamp of his widened genius by a few casual strokes here and there, leaving the bulk of it as something in its kind, excellent, but of a kind in which he had then little interest[2]. Only by assuming some such careless lack of concern can we account for his leaving the play in its gross formlessness.

And finally, there is bibliographical evidence which seems completely to confirm the supposition of a very casual and careless revision. In all probability the Q. printer had Shakespeare's original MS.[3] Yet in it the original passages of the revised portions were not even deleted: minor errors which even a moderately careful re-reading would have detected, go uncorrected. We would specially refer to the confusions in the speech-allocations of II, i, and to our explanation of them in *The Library*

---

[1] As we have seen, there was something to be gained by the insertion of the French names for a public audience in 1592: the dramatist would have gained few thanks, we imagine, for dragging in Navarre, etc. for the express delectation of Elizabeth either at Christmas 1597 or 1598! This gives us another argument against Lee's supposition that these names are to be ascribed to the revision.

[2] Cf. Tennyson's revisions of the poems of 1830 and 1833 in his edition of 1842: the 1830 poems are printed practically without alteration—he had outgrown the type; but the 1833 poems are practically re-written.

[3] See A. W. Pollard, *Shakespeare and the Pirates* and my paper in *The Library*, Oct. 1917.

(October 1917). They imply that the printer's source was Shakespeare's original MS., and they imply that that MS. was very carelessly revised by the author. The explanation was written before we knew of the theory propounded by Mr Pollard in his Sandars Lectures. His conclusions make it generally certain that the original MS., as the only existent good copy, went to the printers of the good Quartos: and our explanation of the confusions at issue would confirm this with respect to *L. L. L.* The printer of the 1598 Q. of *L. L. L.* had Shakespeare's original MS.: prior to publication, it was the only authentic copy of the play, and thus the copy on which the revision would be made; in fact, the existence of original and revised passages in the Q. make it certain that the MS. the printer had was the one on which the revisions were made. And it gives us clear proof on the best of all authorities, the authority of the MS. itself, that the revision of the play was very casual and very desultory indeed.

We do not believe, then, that Shakespeare altered the play much in the revision of 1597–8: we are sure that all the revision which was done was done at that time. And as none of the evidence we have brought forward in our argument for 1592 as the date of the play could conceivably have suggested itself in that year, or alternatively, is of such nature that it could have been inserted in such a revision, we assume that all of it belongs to the original draft, and therefore is valid evidence for our argument that the play was written in 1592, and probably in the autumn of that year.

H. B. CHARLTON.

MANCHESTER.

A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY PLAY-LIST.

THE earliest lists of printed Elizabethan plays that we have to-day are to be found, as is generally known, in the advertisements which booksellers in the seventeenth century appended to some of their publications[1]. Most of these lists date from the second half of the century. By this time, however, and perhaps as early as the first quarter of the century, the practice of play-collecting had sprung up in England. In 1671 Francis Kirkman, the bookseller and publisher, remarked: 'I have been these twenty years a Collector of them, and have conversed with, and enquired of those that have been collecting these fifty years[2].' This would take us back, as Dr Greg notes, to about 1620. Some of the collections which were thus formed were obviously made for the purposes of a second-hand trade. But it is equally certain that others were the result of an antiquarian, rather than a commercial, interest. This would seem to be true of a collection apparently belonging to one Henry Oxenden, of Barham, of which the catalogue was in 1901 'preserved in a manuscript in the possession of Mr A. H. Huth[3].' A second collection which was certainly not formed for trade purposes is one known usually as the Sheldon collection, the catalogue of which forms the subject of the present paper.

Among the manuscripts of Anthony à Wood preserved in the Bodleian library is one (Wood MS. D 18) which, so far as the present writer knows, has not previously come to the notice of students of the Elizabethan drama. It consists of eleven leaves (twenty-one pages) and an index in Wood's own handwriting and bears the heading: 'Catalogue of such playes y^{t} were in y^{e} hands of M^{r} Horne somtimes Fellow of Oriel Coll. They came after his death into y^{e} hands of M^{r} John Houghton of Brasnose, then in Mr Hernes of S^{t} Alds parish, then into y^{e} hands of R. Sheldon of Weston Estq.' The circumstances under which this manuscript came into existence are not to be determined with certainty, nor is the full history of the collection it catalogues as clear as one could wish it. A few things, however, can be learned and may be briefly told.

---

[1] On this general subject see especially Greg, *List of Masques*, Essay Introductory, and a later article by the same writer entitled 'Notes on Dramatic Bibliographers,' *Malone Soc. Collections*, I (1911), 324–340. Cf. also Baker, *Biographia Dramatica*, 1812, I, part I, lxxi–v; *N. & Q.*, 5 S. XII, 203; and Tucker-Brooke, *Shakespeare Apocrypha*, Appendix.

[2] Quoted Greg, *List of Masques*, Essay Introductory, p. i. The whole of Kirkman's 'An Advertisement to the Reader' is printed *ibid.*, Appendix II, pp. xliv–xlvi.

[3] *Ibid.*, Essay Introductory, p. i.

Before the plays which formed the Sheldon collection came into the possession of the wealthy Ralph Sheldon, they seem to have had a rather migratory existence. The three persons mentioned in the heading as previous owners, Mr Horne of Oriel, Mr John Houghton of Brasenose, and Mr Herne (or Hearne) of St Aldate's parish, are all capable of being traced elsewhere, but it is not possible to determine how the collection of plays passed from one to the other of them. The Mr Horne is evidently the John Horne of Hertfordshire, who matriculated at Oriel in 1615 (aged 16), was later a fellow, and received various degrees[1]. In 1636 he became vicar of Headington in Oxfordshire. At his death the collection passed in a manner unknown into the possession of Mr John Houghton of Brasenose. The new owner was a man of some prominence, and we have consequently more information concerning him[2]. He was a Lancashire man, born about 1608, and matriculated at Brasenose College, Oxford, in 1626. He became senior fellow of Brasenose, retained his fellowship during the parliamentary visitation in 1648, and was one of the King's commissioners to visit Oxford in July 1660. Other evidence points to him as a man of some influence. He 'died at his Lodgings called Blackhall, near to this College, on Tuesday Aug. 7, 1677, aet. 69, or thereabouts, and was the next day buried in the Cloister.' How and when the collection of plays passed to the ownership of its third owner, a Mr Herne of St Aldate's parish, Oxford, we do not know; nor is it possible to discover much about him personally. The short notice concerning him in one of the Wood manuscripts is not very flattering: 'James Herne, son of...Herne (somtimes townclerke) of Abendon, died in his house in St. Aldate's parish on M[onday], the first day of June 1685, aged 60 or thereabouts, having been much troubled with the gout for severall yeares before, and was buried among the graves of the Smiths in S. Aldate's church ... He married Anne, daughter and heir of Oliver Smith... ; but had no issue by her. The said James Herne being a sot and beast, his said wife left him and lived about 18 yeares in London by her needle, without any maintenance from her husband[3].' Some time before his death the collection of plays must have passed out of his possession, for he survived the next owner by about a year.

---

[1] See *Reg. of Univ. of Oxford*, vol. II, part II, 342; part III, 348 (Oxford Hist. Soc., vols. 11, 12); Burrows, M., *Register of the Visitors of the Univ. of Oxford*, 536 (Camden Soc., n.s., vol. 29, 1881); Foster, J., *Alumni Oxonienses*, I, 746.

[2] See especially Clark, A., *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood*, 5 vols., 1891–1900, II, 388 *et passim*; Foster, J., *Alumni Oxonienses*, I, 752; Wood, *Athenae Oxon.*, IV, 334.

[3] Wood MS. F. 4. Quoted from Clark, III, 143.

Ralph Sheldon, the most important owner of the collection, was born August 1, 1623, the eldest son of William Sheldon of Beoley, Worcestershire. Having both the means and the leisure to pursue his antiquarian interests, he became well known as a student and collector. Nash in his *History of Worcestershire* says 'he was a person of such rare worth and excellent qualities as deserve particular notice. He was a great patron of learning and learned men, and well skilled in the history and antiquities of his country, sparing no money to set up a standing library at Weston. He was a great friend to Anthony Wood, and left him a legacy of £40. He purchased the valuable MSS. of the ingenious Augustine Vincent, Windsor Herald, and keeper of the records in the Tower, *temp.* Charles I, which at his death he bequeathed to the Heralds' College, where they are still preserved... He travelled often to Rome, and spent some time there to furnish himself with choice books, coins and medals. In short, he was of such remarkable integrity, charity and hospitality, as gained him the universal esteem of all the gentlemen of the county; insomuch that he usually went by the name of the Great Sheldon[1].' In Wood MS. F. 51 Wood says of him: 'At length, his said lady dying 1663, he spared not any money to set up a standing library in his house at Weston... Afterwards buying more printed books, and some MSS. when he could lay hands on them, he came to be acquainted with A. à W. of Oxon. who, by Mr Sheldon's frequent invitation, coming often to Weston, he the said A. W. did put his library in that order and made 2 such exact catalogues of his books that nothing could be purloyn'd thence or taken away, but it could be with little ease straight discovered[2].' Doubtless the catalogue of plays with which we are at present concerned was made under such circumstances as Wood here notes.

The subsequent history of the collection is briefly told. Bliss says: 'As for the library, it continued in the same place till Mr Sheldon's death, at which time...the library was translated to that room [" a little room over the entry into the hall "] by his successor Mr R. S. of Barton[3].' Here it remained for nearly one hundred years, until it was sold at public sale. The same authority continues: 'This excellent collection of books and manuscripts was dispersed by auction in 1781, at the mansion house at Weston, by Christie and Ansell. I have the catalogue priced by John Dennis, an ancient bookseller of Middle Row, Holborn. One of the most valuable lots, namely 422, "Large Collection of scarce old Plays by various authors, bound in 56 volumes, quarto," was purchased by King the bookseller for 5 *l.* 5 *s.*[1] it was repurchased at the bookseller's private auction after the sale for 18 *l.* 1 *s.* by Dennis, and sold by him for 31 *l.* 10 *s.* to Henderson, the actor, on the spot; for Henderson, accompanied by Isaac Reed, had walked down from London to Weston, partly to attend the sale, and partly to pay their devotions at the shrine of Shakspeare at Stratford, which was hard by... It may be added, that many of the rarest of the old plays have since found their way into the Bodleian. Henderson allowed Malone to select such as were wanting in his collection at the time of the sale at Weston...[2]'

---

[1] Nash, T. R., *Collections for the History and Antiquities of Worcestershire*, 2 vols., London, 1781–99; quoted Fletcher, W. Y., *English Book Collectors*, London, 1902, pp. 108–9.

[2] Clark, III, 102–103.

[3] *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, Oxford, 1848, I, 262–3.

The catalogue of plays prepared by Anthony à Wood does not seem to have been complete. Perhaps additions were made to the collection after he had finished. One of the most valuable items in the Sheldon collection, an important copy of the First Folio Shakespeare[3], is not mentioned in the catalogue. Sir Sidney Lee says Sheldon acquired it about 1650[4]. It was sold along with the rest of the library in 1781 to one Vanderberg, and is still in existence with the Sheldon arms on its cover. Other volumes sold at the same time and apparently not mentioned in the Wood catalogue are found in lots 49 (Warburton's *Shakespeare*), 88 (Hanmer's *Shakespeare*), 168 (Collection of Plays, four volumes[5]), 181 ('Massenger's Plays, Howard's Plays, and eight more,' sold for 2*s.* 6*d.*), 217 (Dryden's Plays, 6 vols., Rowe's Plays, 2 vols.), 342 ('Scarce Old Plays, 4 vol. Octavo,' purchased by King for 7*s.* 6*d.*), and 522 (Beaumont and Fletcher's *Works*, folio). Some volumes of Euripides, Terence, and Molière were also included.

A word, finally, remains to be said concerning the date of the catalogue. The list is undated, but since Wood died in 1695, it cannot be later than this. It is almost equally certain that it belongs before June 23, 1684, the date of Ralph Sheldon's death. It is not earlier than July 21, 1671, the date on which Wood first became acquainted with

---

[1] This statement is confirmed by the records of the auctioneers.

[2] Bliss, *op. cit.*, p. 263 note.

[3] The copy is of importance because the concluding passages of *Romeo and Juliet* and the opening passages of *Troilus and Cressida* are printed twice over at different parts of the volume. The peculiarity was first discovered by Sir Sidney Lee, who pointed out its significance before the Bibliographical Society in 1898. Cf. *Trans. of the Bibliographical Soc.*, IV, 148–50.

[4] *Census*, p. 22.

[5] Possibly included in the Wood catalogue.

Sheldon[1]. From certain evidence it is apparent that Wood was engaged in cataloguing parts of the library between 1675 and 1680[2], and we shall probably not be far wrong if we place the present list approximately within these years.

Catalogue of such playes y^{t} were in y^{e} hands of M^{r} Horne somtimes Fellow of Oriel Coll. They came after his death into y^{e} hands of M^{r} John Houghton of Brasnose, then in Mr Hernes of S^{t} Alds parish, then into y^{e} hands of R. Sheldon of Weston Estq.

Recreations with the muses fol. by Will. Earl of Sterline. London. 1637. Containing I.[3] 4 monarchick Tragedies viz.
1. The Tragedy of Croesus. 2. of Darius. 3. The Alexandræan[,] Tragedy. 4. The Tragedy of Julius Cæsar.
2. Domes-day or y^{e} great day of y^{e} Lords Judgment in 12. houres.
3. A parænesis to prince Henry.
4. Jonathan. an heroick poem intended.

The spanish bawd or the Tragick Comedie of Calisto and melibea. Lond. 1631. fol.
The Lost Lady. T. C. Lond. 1639.
The Citye match. C. by D^{r} Jasp. Mayne. oxon. 1639. fol.
The Q[ueen] of Arragon. T. C. fol. Lond. 1640.
Aglaura. Lond. 1638.
The Sophy. Lond. 1642 (by S^{r} Jo. Denha*m*).
M^{r}
[**P.** 2] The Witts. C. S^{r} Will. Dauenant seruant to her majestie. Lond. 1636.
The just Italian. by y^{e} same. Lond. 1630.
The platonick Louers. T. C. by the same, seruant to her majestie. 1636.
The Tragedy of Albouine K. of y^{e} Lombards by y^{e} sa*me*. Lond. 1629.
The Cruell Brother. T. by y^{e} same. 1630.
The vnfortunate Louers. T. by y^{e} same. Lond. 1643[4].
Eastward hoe. by Geor. Chapman. B. Johnson. Joh. Marston. Lond. 1605.
Al fooles. C. by Georg. chapman. Lond. 1605.
Monseiur D'oliue. C. by G. chapman. Lond. 1606.
The Widdowes Teares. C. by G. chap. Lond. 1612.
May-day. C. by. G. chap. Lond. 1611.
The Ball. C. by. G. Chap. & James Shirley. Lond. 1639.
The Gentleman vsher. by. G. Chapman. Lond. [1607[5]] 1606.
Bussy D'Ambois. T. by. G. Chap. The time wh printed toren out.
The reueng of Bussy D'ambois. T. by G. chap. Lond. 1613.
The Warrs of pomp. & Cæsar. by G. chap. Lond. 1631.
The Tragedy of Chabot Admirall of France by. G. C. & Jam. Shirley. Lond. 1639.
[**P.** 3] The Conspiracy & Tragedy of Charles Duke of Byron Marshall of France. by. G. Chapman dedicated to S^{r} Tho. Walsyngha*m* & Tho. his son. Lond.... 2. playes.
Wit in Constable. C. written 1639. by Hen. Glapthorne. Lond. 1640.

---

[1] Clark, II, 227–8.

[2] In Wood MS. D. 6 is a dated catalogue of manuscripts in Sheldon's library, compiled by Wood in August and September, 1675. Wood MS. E. 10 is a catalogue of books and pamphlets, dated August 1675. (Cf. Clark, II, 321.) Wood has also left the statement, 'Done by me in Mr Sheldon's library—took all his books downe and placed them anew, 1677; numbred them within side, and without by papers stuck upon the dorse; made a catalogue of them as they stand, in his long paper book; made another catalogue in alphabet with very great paines and industrie, anno 1678, which is a long paper book; pasted his armes in every book, 1679, 1678, 1680:—made a catalogue of his MSS., made several indices to them,...' (Clark, II, 475).

[3] I *inserted above line.*

[4] 1643 *written over* 1633.

[5] 1607 *crossed out in MS.*

The Hollander. C. written 1635. by H. Glap. Lond. 1640.

The Ladyes priuiledg. by H. Glap. Lond. 1640.

The Tragedy of Albertus wallenstein Late Duke of Fridland, and Generall to y^{e} Emp*er*our Fardinand 2. by H. Glapt. Lond. 1640. Copie of verses on it by Alex Gil.

~~[Alex.[1]]~~ Argalus & parthenia *per* eunde*m*. Lond. 1639.

whitehall a poem written 1642. with Elegies on y^{e} right honorable Franc. Earl of Bedford & Hen. Earl of manchester, with an anniv[er]sarie on y^{e} timeless death of Mr̄s Ann Kirk wife to Georg Kirk. Gentl. of y^{e} Robes drowned passing London bridge July 6. 1641. by H. Glap. Lond. 1643. dedicated to Capt. Rich. Louelace.

The Bride. C. acted 1638. by Tho. Nabbes. Lond. 1640.

Couent Garden. C. by Tho. Nabbes. Lond. 1639.

Tottenham Court C. acted. 1633. Lond. 1638. by T. Nabbs.

Microcosmus. a morall mask. Lond. 1637. by T. Nab.

The vnfortunat mother T. Lond. 1640. by. T. Nab.

[P. 4] Hanniball & Scipio. Hist. Trag. acted 1635 Lond. 1637. by Th. Nab.

The Springs Glorie, vindicating Loue by Temp*er*ance agst the Tenent &. moralized in a maske. Lond. 1638. by Th. Nab.

The Loue of[2] K. Dauid & fair Bethsabe, with the Tragedie of Absalon. &c. by Georg Peele. Lond. 1599.

The Wounds of Ciuill War. ‡ Tr. Tho. Lodge. Lond. 1594. ‡ liuely set forth in y^{e} true Tragedies of Marius & Scilla.

Cornelia by Tho. Kyd. Lond. 1594. Trag.

The downfall of Rob. E. of Huntingdon, afterwards calld Robin Hood of Merrie Sherwodde with his loue to chast matilda, y^{e} L*or*d fitzwaters daugh. afterwards his faire maid Marian. Lond. 1601 made as tis said by Skelton. v. pits[3].

The famous Chron. of K. Ed. 1. S^{r}named Edw. Longshanks, also y^{e} life of lleuellin Rebell in wales, lastly the sinking of Q. Elinor at charing cross & rose againe at potters hith, now named Queen hith. by G. peele. Lond. 1593.

Tamberlaine y^{e} Great Tr. Lond. 1605. published from y^{e} authors Copie by R. I. y^{e} printer[4].

The Spanish Tragedie conta[i]ning y^{e} Lamentable End of don Horatio & Bel-Imp*er*ia with the **[P. 5]** pitifull death of old Hieronimo. Lond. 1610.

The battel of Alcazar fought in Barbarie[5] betw. Sebastian K. of portugall & Abdelmelec K. of Marocco, with the death of Capt. Stukely. Lond. 1594.

The Insatiat Countess. Lond. 1616.

The bond man, an anci*en*t story, by phil. Massinger. Lond. 1638. dedicated to philip E. of Montgomery, to whom phil. Massinger y^{e} authors father was seruant.

A new way to pay old debts. C. *per* eunde*m*. Lond. 1633.

The Renegado a Trag. com. *per* eunde*m*. Lond. 1630.

The picture. Tr. c. *per* eunde*m*. Lond. 1630.

Emp*er*our of y^{e} East. tr. c. *per* eunde*m*. Lond. 1632.

Maid of honour. *per* eund. Lond. 1632.

The great Duke of Florence, Com. Hist. *per* eunde*m*. Lond. 1636.

Duke of Millaine Tr. Lond. 1623. *per* eunde*m*.

Virgin Martyr Tr. *per* eund. et Tho. Dekker. Lond. 1631.

Fatall Dowry. Tr. *per* p. m. et N. f. (i e in fuller ph. massinger et Nath. Feild. [*sic*] Lond. 1632.

Vnnaturall Brother[6] by p. massing. Lond. 1639. Trag.

The Romane Actor. Tr. *per* eund. Lond. 1629.

---

[1] Crossed out.

[2] of *inserted above line.*

[3] John Pits, whose *Relationum Historicarum de Rebus Anglicis* (1619) contains an 'Appendix Illustrium Scriptorum.'

[4] The 1590 edition was printed by Richard Jones, the 1605 edition for Edward White with no mention of Richard Jones on the title-page. Wood makes this statement on the basis of 'To The Gentlemen Readers' signed 'R. I Printer.'

[5] Fought in Barbarie *inserted above line.*

[6] *Written again above line.*

[P. 6] The Returne from p*ar*nassus or the scourge of simony. Acted by y^e students of S. Johns Coll. in Cambr. Lond. 1606.

Lingua or the Combate of y^e Tungue. Com. Lond. 1632.

The Jealous Louers. Com. acted by Trin. Coll. students in Cambr. by Tho. Randolp A. M. fellow of y^t house. Lond. 1632.

Aristippus or y^e Jouiall philosopher, p*er* eund. Lond. 1630.

Albumazar. com. presented before y^e Kings Ma. at Cambr. by y^e Gentlemen of Trin. Coll. Lond. 1634.

Sicelides a piscatory, Acted in Kings Coll. in Cambr. Lond. 1631.

Riuall Freinds. Com. by. pet. Hausted M^r of A. of Qu. Coll. in Camb. Lond. 1632.

Sopister. Com. Lond. 1639.

[P. 7] Miseries of Enforc't marriage by George Wilkins. Lond. 1629. v. Cat. Incept.[1]

History of Fryer Bacon & Fr. Bungay by Rob. Greene A.M. Lond. 1630.

The dumb kt. Com. Lond. 1633.

Seuen Champions of x^{t}endome by Jo. Kirke. Lond. 1638. neuer acted before y^t yeare.

Knaue in Graine, new vampt. Com. by J. D. Gent. Lond. 1640.

The noble Stranger, by Lewis Sharpe. Lond. 1640.

A new Trick to cheat the Deuill. Com. by R. D. Gent. Lond. 1639.

Strange discouery. Tr. Co. by J. G. Gent. Lond. 1640.

The Swaggering Damsell. Com. by Rob. Chamb*er*laine. London. 1640. vid. philipps Theatru*m* poetaru*m*.

[P. 8] The Conspiracy. Tra. by Hen. Killigrew. Lond. 1638.

phœnix in her Flames. Tr. by Mr. Will. Lower. Lond. 1639.

The Reuengers Trag. Lond. 1608[2]. The Reuengers Tragedy. Lond. 1608.

The Atheists Tragedy. Title torne out.

The discontented Colonell. by S^r Jo. Sucklin..Lond....

Thiery K. of France & his Brother Theodoret, the Tragedy. Lond. 1621.

Tragedy of Muleasses y^e Turke & Borgias Gouernour of Florence. by Jo. Mason A. M. Lond. 1632.

The Tragedy of Nero. Lond. 1633.

[P. 9] A fine Companion by Shakerly Marmyo*n*. Lond. 1633.

Hollands Leaguer or a discourse of y^e life & Actions of Donna Britannica Hollandia y^e Archmistris of the wicked women of Eutopia. com. p*er* eund. A M. Lond. 1632[3].

The Antiquary p*er* eunde*m*. a com. Lond. 1641.

Northerne Lass. Com. by Rich. Brome. Lond. 1632.

The Sparagus Garden. com. p*er* eund. acted 1635. Lond. 1640.

Antipodes, com. p*er* eund. Lond. 1640.

The Late Lancashire Witches by Tho. Heywood & Rich. Broome. Lond. 1634.

pathomachia or y^e battle of Affections by F. Constable. Lond. 1630.

comedy wherein is shewed how a man may choos a good wife from a bad. Lond. 1634.

[P. 10] The male content augmented by marston, with y^e Additions played by y^e Kings majesties seruants, written by Jo. Webster. Lond. 1604.

The Deuills Law Case, or w^n women go to law, y^e Deuill is full of business. T. C. by Jo. Webster. Lond. 1623.

The White Deuill. or the Tragedy of paulo Giordano Vrsini, Duke of Brachiano &. p*er* eunde*m*, Lond. 1612.

The Dutchess of Malfy. Tr. p*er* eunde*m* 1640.

The deseruing fauorite. by Lodowick Carlell Esq. Gentleman of the bowes, and Groome of y^e K. & Queens priuie chamber. Lond. 1629.

---

[1] Reading uncertain.

[2] 1608 *written over* 1638.

[3] Wood is apparently confusing the play with a pamphlet published the same year with a title page more nearly corresponding to the entry above. Cf. *The Dramatic Works of Shackerley Marmion*, ed. J. Maidment and W. H. Logan, Edinburgh, 1875, p. 3.

Torquato Tassoe's Aminta, Englisht. Lond. 1628.

[**P. 11**] Vertumnus siue Annus Recurrens Oxonij 29. Aug. 1605 Coram Jac. Rege a Joannensibus in scena recitatus ab vno scriptus. 4^o. Lond. 1607.

The marriage of Arts. Com. by Barten Holyday A. M. stud. of x^t ch. acted by y^e students of y^e s*a*id House before y^e vniu*er*sitie at shrouetide. Lond. 1630.

The Raging Turke. Tra. or Bajazet 2^d[1] by Tho. Goffe A. m. stud. of ch. ch. Lond. 1631.

The Couragious Turke. or Amurath. 1.[2] Tra. *per* eund. Lond. 1632.

The Trag. of Orestes *per* eunde*m*. Lond. 1633.

The Royall Slaue. *per* W. Cartw. T. C. 2^d. Edit. Ox. 1640.

Sicily & Naples or y^e fatall Union. Tr. by S. H. A. B. E Coll. Exon. Oxon. 1640.

Fuimus Troes, Æneid. 2. The True Trojanes &c. acted by y^e Gentlemen Students of Magd. Coll. in oxon. Lond. 1633.

[**P. 12**] Pericles Prince of Tyre. by W. Shakespeare. Lond. 1630.

The Puritane or y^e widdow of watling street *per* eunde*m*.

The Chronicle Historie of y^e whole life & death of Tho. L*or*d Cromwell *per* eunde*m*. Lond. 1613.

Tragedie of Solimon & perseda. Lond. 1599.

A chast maid in cheapside, by Tho. Middleton Gent. Lond. 1630. com.

A mad world my m^{rs}. *per* eunde*m*. Lond. 1640. com. written 1620. y^e author died soone after.

The noble Souldier &[c]. Tr. by S. R. (*per*haps Sam. Rowley). Lond. 1634.

y^r 5 Gallants by Tho. Middleton. Lond.....

A fair quarrell &c. by Tho. Middleton & will. Rowley Gent. Lond. 1622. Middleton seems to be then dead.

A trick to catch y^e old one. by Tho. Middleton. Lond. 1616.

A woman neuer vext com. by W. Rowley one of his majesties seruants. Lond. 1632.

All's Lost by Lust. Tr. by Will. Rowley. Lond. 1633.

A shomaker, a Gentleman. Com. *per* eund. Lond. 1638.

w^n yo see me yo know me or y^e Hist. of K. H. 8. by Samuel Rowley seruant to y^e prince. Lond. 1632.

[**P. 13**] The troblesome raigne & lamentable death of K. Ed. 2. with the tragicall fall of proud mortimer a[n]d also y^e life & death of peirs Gaueston E. of Cornwall, fauourite to K. Ed. 2. by x^{to}f. Marlow Gent. Lond. 1622.

Rich Jew of Malta a Trag. *per* eundem. Lond. 1633 dedicated to Mr Tho. Hamon of Greys Inn. by Tho. Heywood.

A xtian turned Turk or y^e tragicall liues & deaths of y^e two famous pirates *Ward* & *Dansiker* by Rob. Daborne Gent. Lond. 1612.

Trag. [of[3]] of M^r Arden of Fauersham in Kent. Lond. 1633.

The Trag. of Hoffman or a Reuenge for a Father. Lond. 1631 published by one Hugh perry but he was not y^e author of it.

The vow breaker or y^e faire maid of Clifton in Notting*am*shire. Lond. 1636. by will. S*am*pson.

Herod & Antipater, Trag. by Geruas Markha*m* Will. Sampson Gent. Lond. 1622.

The Rebellian. Trag. by Tho. Rawlyns, Lond. 1640.

The valiant Scot, by william Bowyer[4] Gent. Lond. 1637.

[**P. 14**] The weakest goes to y^e wall. Lond. 1600.

The Wit of a woman, Com. Lond. 1604.

S^r Giles Gooscappe K^t. Com. Lond. 1606.

Michaelmas Terme. Lond. 1607.

---

[1] or Bajazet 2^d *inserted above line.*

[2] or Amurath. 1. *inserted above line.*

[3] Crossed out.

[4] The title-page reads 'By J. W. Gent.' The dedication is signed by William Bowyer. On the question of authorship, etc., see the discussion of this play by J. W. Carver in the University of Pennsylvania's *Studies in English Drama*, New York, 1917, pp. 75–104.

Euery woman in her humour. 1609. Lond.

The family of loue. Lond. 1608.

swetnam, y^e woman-hater arraigned by women. Com. Lond. 1620.

The shomaker*s* holyday or Gentle Craft with the humourous life of Simon Eyre, Shomaker & Lo*r*d Mayor of Lond. Lond. 1618.

The merry Deuill of Edmonton. Lond. 1617.

The faire maid of y^e Exchange &[c]. Lond. 1625.

A woman will haue her will. Com. Lond. 1626.

[**P. 15**] The faire maid of y^e west, or a Girle worth gold. by Tho. Heywood. Lond. 1631.

The wise woman of Hogsdon. Com. by Tho. Heywood. Lond. 1638.

The Golden age or y^e liues of Jupiter & Saturne. p*er* eunde*m*. Lond. 1611.

The Siluer age including y^e loue of Jupiter to Alcmena, the birth of Hercules & y^e Rape of p*ro*serpine &[c]. Lond. 1613.

The Brazen age &[c]. by Tho. Heywood. Lond. 1613.

The Iron age T. C.[1] p*er* eund. Lond. 1632. [in his epist. to y^e Read*er*, he saith y^t he had an entire hand or at least a maine finger in y^e composing 220 playes] This is in his epist. to y^e Traueller.

The English Traueller p*er* eunde*m*. Lond. 1633.

A mayden head well lost, Com. p*er* eunde*m*. Lond. 1634. the author then liuing.

Loues maistresse or y^e Queens Maske p*er* eund. Lond. 1636.

A woman kild with kindness p*er* eunde*m*. 3. edit. 1617. Lond.

The Royall King. & loyall subject[2] p*er* eunde*m*. Lond. 1637.

A challeng for beauty p*er* eunde*m*. Lond. 1636.

The 4. prentises of London wth y^e Conquest of Jerusale*m*. p*er* eunde*m* &[c]. Lond. 1615.

The Rape of Lucrece p*er* eund. Tr. Lond. 1630.

[**P. 16**] A volume of playes by James Shirley of Grayes In. Gent. Containing y^e numb*er* of 23. written from y^e year 1629. to 1640. note y^t one of those 23. Calld y^e Martyrd Soldier was written by Hen. Shirley Gent. printed at Lond. 1638.

The wonder of a kingdome, by Tho. Dekker. Lond. 1636.

Northward hoe by $\left.\begin{array}{l}\text{Tho. Dekker}\\\text{Jo. Webster}\end{array}\right\}$ Lond. 1607.

Westw. hoe. by y^e sa*me* pe*r*sons. Lond. 1607.

The honest whore by Tho. Dekker. Lond. 1635....

old Fortunatus. Com. p*er* eund. Lond. 1600.

[math[3]] match at midnight, p*er* eunde*m*. Lond....

Match me in Lond. Tr. C. p*er* eunde*m*. Lond. 1631.

The whore of Babylon p*er* eund. Lond. 1607.

The bloody Banquet. Tr. p*er* eund. Lond. 1639.

If it be not good the Deuill is in it. p*er* eunde*m*. Lond....

If y^o know not me y^o know no body. {Lond. 1632. or y^e Troubles of Q. Eliz.

[**P. 17**] The fancies chast & noble by Jo. Ford. Lond. 1638.

The Louers Melancholy. Lond. 1629.

The Ladies Triall. Lond. 1639. p*er* eunde*m*.

The Chronicle Historie of p*er*kin Warbeck p*er* eund. Lond. 1634.

Tis pitty she is a whore. p*er* eund. Lond. 1633.

The broken heart. Tr. p*er* eund. Lond. 1633.

The heire. Com. acted. 1620. per Tho. May. Lond. 1633.

Rhodon & Iris, a pastorall, presented at the Florists feast in Norwich May 3. 1631. Lond. 1631 by Ralp Kneuet.

A maske presented at Ludlow Castle 1634. Lond. 1637 (by H. Lawes published).

[**P. 18**] The honest Lawyer p*er* S. S. Lond. 1616.

Ram-Alley or Merry Tricks com. by y^e Lo*r*d[4] Barry. Lond. 1611.

---

[1] T. C. *inserted above line.*

[2] & loyall subject *inserted above line.*

[3] Crossed out.

[4] On the perversion of 'Lord Barry' into 'Lodowick Barry' see W. J. Lawrence, *Studies in Philology* (Univ. of N. Carolina), vol. XIV, p. 52.

Amends for Ladies. Com. by Nat. Feild. Lond. 1618.

Cupids Whirligig. by E. S. Lond. 1616.

The Hog hath lost his pea^{r}le. by Rob. Taylor. Lond. 1614.

Law tricks or who would haue thought. Lond. 1608 by Joh. Day.

Two merry Milkmaid*es*. Com. by J. C. Lond. 1620.

Greens Tu quoq*ue* or y^{e} Citie Gallant by Joh. Cook Gent. published by Tho Heywood. Lond. 1622.

The Hector of Germany, or y^{e} Palsgraue. prime Ele[c]tor, by W. Smith. Lond. 1615.

[**P. 19**] The Fleire. by Edw. Sharpha*m* of y^{e} Middle temple Gent. Lond. 1631.

No body & Some body.—

The phœnix. Lond. 1607.

S^{r} Tho
The Trauells of 3. English brothers S^{r} Anthony } Shirley. Lond. 1607.
M^{r} Rob

A game at Chesse...

wyly beguild. Com. Lond. 1623.

The Costly whore. Lond. 1633.

Fair Em the Millers daugh. of Manchester with y^{e} loue of Will. y^{e} Conq. Lond. 1631.

The Isle of Gulls. Lond. 1633.

The life of y^{e} Dutchess of Suffolke. Lond. 1631.

Adrasta. or y^{e} womans spleen & Loues Conquest. T. C. Lond. 1635. by Joh. Jones.

Mercurius Britannicus, Tragicom. Latelie..

[**P. 20**] The Tragedy of Antigone. Lond. 1631.
Cleopatra. Lond. 1632. by Tho. May. Esq.
Agrippina. Lond. 1639.

The Shepards holyday. Tr. Co. by Jos. Rutter. Lond. 1635.

The Cid. Tr. Co. fro*m* french into Engl. *per* eund. Lond. 1637.

The 2^{d} *par*t of y^{e} Cid. Lond. 1640. *per* eund. See in Cat. Bal[1] for Monsieur Corneill.

Loues Riddle a pastorall Com. by Abr. Cowley. æt. 13. Lond. 1638.

x^{ts} passion. Tr. written in Lat. by Hug. Grotius Englished by Georg Sandys with notes. Lond. 1640.

Aruiragus & philicia. Lond. 1639.

The Prisoners & Claracilla. by Tho. Killigrew. Gent. Lond. 1641.

The Tragedie of Lodovick Sforza Duke of Millan. by Rob. Gomersall. Lond. 1628 dedicated to Franc. Hyde *pro*ctor of y^{e} Univ*ers*. oxon.

The muses looking glass. by Tho. Randolp. Lond. 1643.

seu*er*all Tragedies & Com. Collected into one volum by I know not who*me*. Lond. 1633. 8^{o}.

[**P. 21**] 6. Court Comedies often presented & acted before Q. Elizab. written by the only Rare poet of y^{t} time, the wittie comicall, facetiously-quick & vnparalleld John Lilly M^{r} of Art. Lond. 1632. 8^{o}.

[Pp. 29, 30] [LIST OF NAMES[2].]

Will. E. of Sterline. 1637
D^{r} Mayne 1639
S^{r} will. Dauenant 1636
Georg Chapman 1605
Jo. Marston 1605. one Jo. marson went out Mr A. of ch. ch. 1606
Ben Johnson. 1605
James Shirley 1639
Hen. Glapthorne 1639
Tho. Nabs 1638
Geo. Peele 1599
Tho. Lodge 1594
Tho. Kyd. 1594
Skelton

---

[1] *Reading doubtful.*

[2] The list of names is written on pp. 29–30; pp. 22–28 are blank.

Phil. Massniger [*sic*] 1638
Tho. Dekker 1631
Nath. Feild. 1632
Tho. Randolp 1632 Camb.
pet. Hausted 1632. Camb.
Geor. Wilkins 1629
Rob. Green A. m. 1630
Jo. Kirk 1638
Leuis Sharp 1640
Rob. Chamb*er*laine 1640
Hen. Killigrew 1638
Will. Lower 1639
Sʳ Jo. Sucklyn
Jo. Mason A.M. 1632
Shakerley Marmion 1633
Ric. Brome 1632
Tho. Heywood 1634
Fra. Constable 1634 publisher only
Jo. Webster 1634
Lodowick Carlell Esq. &c. 1629
Barton Holyday 1630
Tho. Goff 1631
W. Cartwright 1640
s. Harᵈⁱⁿᵍ of Exeter coll. A. b.
W. Shakspeare 1630
Tho. Middleton 1630
S. R. Sam. Rowley *per*haps 1634
Will. Rowley 1622
xᵗᵒf. Marlow 1622
Rob. Daborne. 1612
Will. Sampson. 1636
Geru. markha*m* 1622
Tho. Rawlyns 1640
Will. Bowyer 1637
Jeams Shirley 1630
Hen. Shirley 1638
Jo. Ford 1638
Ralph Kneuet 1631
H. Lawes
Ld. Barrey. 1611
Nat. Feild 1618
Rob. Taylor 1614
Jo. Day 1608
Jo. Cook 1622...
W. Smith 1615
Edw. Sharpham 1631
Jo. Jones 1635
Tho. May 1631
Hen. Killigrew. 1638
Tho. Killigrew 1664
Sʳ Will. Killigrew 1666

ALBERT C. BAUGH.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., U.S.A.

LAPP SONGS IN ENGLISH LITERATURE.

ONE of the most distinguished scholars of the seventeenth century was Johan Scheffer. Born at Strassburg in 1621, he became famous for his learning at an early age and in 1648 was appointed professor of law and rhetoric at Upsala. On account of his extensive knowledge and critical acumen he came to be highly esteemed in Sweden, where he inaugurated the study of classical philology and of Swedish literary history[1]. Amongst his manifold activities must be mentioned his keen interest in Swedish archæology, which ultimately led him to produce a work that was to have a certain influence on English literature. In 1673 he published at Frankfort a quarto in Latin entitled *Lapponia*. Within a short time it was translated into French, German and Dutch and attracted considerable attention.

Nowhere was its popularity greater than in England. An English version appeared at Oxford in 1674, a second, enlarged edition in London in 1704, and a third, an abridged translation, also in London in 1751. The portion of the *History of Lapland* which was to leave some traces behind in English literature was limited to two Lapp songs which Scheffer obtained from a Laplander called Olaus Matthias. The Frankfort edition gave the Lapp original[2] and a Latin rendering which runs thus:

No. 1.

Kulnasatz, rangifer meus parvus, properandum nobis iterque porro faciendum, loca uliginosa vasta sunt et cantiones nos deficiunt. Nec tamen tædiosus mihi palus Kaige es, tibi palus Kailvva dico vale. Multæ cogitationes animum meum subeunt, dum per paludem Kaige vehor. Rangifer meus, simus agiles levesque, sic citius absolvemus laborem, eoque veniemus quo destinamus; ibi videbo amicam meam ambulantem. Kulnasatz, rangifer meus, prospice ac vide utrum non cernas eam se lavantem[3].

No. 2.

Sol, clarissimum emitte lumen in paludem Orra. Si, enisus in summa picearum cacumina, scirem me visurum Orra paludem, in ea eniterer ut viderem inter quos amica mea esset flores; omnes suscinderem frutices recens ibi enatos, omnes ramos præsecarem, hos viventes ramos. Cursum nubium essem secutus, quæ iter suum instituunt versus paludem Orra, si ad te volare possem alis, cornicum alis. Sed mihi desunt alæ, querquedulæ pedesque, anserum pedes plantæve[1] bonæ, quæ deferre me valeant ad te. Satis expectasti diu per tot dies, tot dies tuos optimos, oculis tuis jucundissimis, corde tuo amicissimo. Quod si longissime velles effugere, cito tamen te consequerer. Quid firmius validiusve esse potest quam contorti nervi catenæve ferreæ, quæ durissime ligant? Si amor contorquet caput nostrum, mutat cogitationes et sententias. Puerorum voluntas, voluntas venti; juvenum cogitationes, longæ cogitationes. Quos si audirem omnes, omnes a via, a via justa declinarem. Unum est consilium quod capiam, ita scio viam rectiorem me reperturum[2].

---

[1] Cf. Schück and Warburg, *Illustrerad Svensk Litteraturhistoria*, 2nd ed., Vol. I, pp. 359—361.

[2] According to J. Qvigstad, the Lapp text of Scheffer is very corrupt. (Cf. R. Bergström's essay in *Nyare bidrag till kännedom om de svenska landsmålen ock svenskt folklif*, ed. J. A. Lundell, Vol. v, Stockholm, 1884–91.)

[3] Frankfort edition, p. 283.

The English edition of 1674 omitted this Latin version but reproduced the Lapp original with an English translation. In 1704 only the English was given and in 1751 even this was cast aside. The two songs in their English dress are as follows:

No. 1.

Kulnasatz my Rain-deer
We have a long journy to go;
The Moor's are vast,
And we must hast,
Our strength I fear
Will fail if we are slow,
And so
Our songs will do.

Kaigè the watery Moor,
Is pleasant unto me,
Though long it be;
Since it doth to my Mistriss lead,
Whom I adore;
The Kilwa Moor,
I nere again will tread.

Thoughts fill'd my mind
Whilst I thro Kaigè past.
Swift as the wind,
And my desire,
Winged with impatient fire,
My Rain-deer let us hast.

So shall we quickly end our pleasing pain,
Behold my Mistresse there,
With decent motion walking ore the Plain.
Kulnasatz my Rain-deer,
Look yonder, where
She washes in the Lake.
See while she swims,
The waters from her purer limbs
New cleerness take[3].

---

[1] The original has a misprint, 'planætve.'
[2] Frankfort edition, p. 284.
[3] Edition of 1674, pp. 112—113.

No. 2.

With brightest beams let the Sun shine
On Orra Moor,
Could I be sure,
That from the top o'th lofty Pine,
I Orra Moor might see,
I to his highest bow would climb,
And with industrious labor try,
Thence to descry
My Mistress, if that there she be.

Could I but know amidst what Flowers,
Or in what shade she staies,
The gaudy Bowers
With all their verdant pride,
Their blossomes and their spraies,
Which make my Mistress disappear;
And her in Envious darkness hide,
I from the roots and bed of Earth would tear.

Upon the raft of clouds I'd ride
Which unto Orra fly,
O'th Ravens I would borrow wings,
And all the feathered In-mates of the sky:
But wings alas are me denied,
The Stork and Swan their pinions will not lend,
There's none who unto Orra brings,
Or will by that kind conduct me befriend.

Enough enough thou hast delaied
So many Summers daies,
The best of daies that crown the year,
Which light upon the eielids dart,
And melting joy upon the heart:
But since that thou so long hast staied,
They in unwelcome darkness disappear.
Yet vainly dost thou me forsake,
I will pursue and overtake.

What stronger is then bolts of steel?
What can more surely bind?
Love is stronger far then it;
Upon the Head in triumph she doth sit:
Fetters the mind,
And doth controul,
The thought and soul.

A youths desire is the desire of wind,
All his Essaies
Are long delaies,
No issue can they find.
Away fond Counsellors, away,
No more advice obtrude
I'le rather prove
The guidance of blind Love;
To follow you is certainly to stray:
One single Counsel tho unwise is good[1].

---

[1] Edition of 1674, pp. 114—115.

These Lapp songs make their next appearance in the *Spectator*. On April 30, 1712, Steele wrote a paper on love and after some general remarks printed a letter making definite reference to Scheffer's *History of Lapland* and containing a new version of the second Lapp song[1]. It runs thus:

Thou rising Sun, whose gladsome Ray
Invites my Fair to Rural Play,
Dispel the Mist, and clear the Skies,
And bring my Orra to my Eyes.

Oh! were I sure my Dear to view,
I'd climb that Pine-Tree's topmost Bough,
Aloft in Air that quivering plays,
And round and round for ever gaze.

My Orra Moor, where art thou laid?
What Wood conceals my sleeping Maid?
Fast by the Roots enrag'd I'll tear
The Trees that hide my promis'd Fair.

Oh! I cou'd ride the Clouds and Skies,
Or on the Raven's Pinions rise:
Ye Storks, ye Swans, a moment stay,
And waft a Lover on his Way.

My Bliss too long my Bride denies,
Apace the wasting Summer flies:
Nor yet the wintry Blasts I fear,
Not Storms or Night shall keep me here.

What may for Strength with Steel compare?
Oh! Love has Fetters stronger far:
By Bolts of Steel are Limbs confin'd,
But cruel Love enchains the Mind.

No longer then perplex thy Breast,
When Thoughts torment, the first are best;
'Tis mad to go, 'tis Death to stay,
Away to Orra, haste away.

This song, a duly conventionalised and glossy adaptation of Scheffer, afforded much pleasure to 'the town' and so on June 16, 1712, Steele wrote a paper for the *Spectator* containing the following version of the first Lapp song[2]:

Haste, my Rain-Deer, and let us nimbly go
Our am'rous Journey through this dreery Waste;
Haste, my Rain-Deer! still, still, thou art too slow;
Impetuous Love demands the Lightning's Haste.

Around us far the Rushy Moors are spread:
Soon will the Sun withdraw his chearful Ray:
Darkling and tir'd we shall the Marshes tread,
No Lay unsung to cheat the tedious Way.

---

[1] Paper No. 366. The version has been attributed to Ambrose Phillips. Whoever the writer was, he evidently had only the earlier English version before him, or he could not have taken 'Orra Moor' to be the name of the girl.

[2] Paper No. 406.

The wat'ry Length of these unjoyous Moors
Does all the flow'ry Meadows pride excel;
Through these I fly to her my Soul adores;
Ye flow'ry Meadows, empty Pride, Farewel.

Each Moment from the Charmer I'm confin'd,
My Breast is tortur'd with impatient Fires;
Fly, my Rain-Deer, fly swifter than the Wind,
Thy tardy Feet wing with my fierce Desires.

Our pleasing Toil will then be soon o'erpaid,
And thou, in Wonder lost, shalt view my Fair,
Admire each Feature of the lovely Maid,
Her artless Charms, her Bloom, her sprightly Air.

But lo! with graceful Motion there she swims,
Gently moving each ambitious Wave;
The crowding Waves transported clasp her Limbs:
When, when, oh when, shall I such Freedoms have!

In vain, you envious Streams, so fast you flow,
To hide her from a Lover's ardent Gaze:
From ev'ry Touch you more transparent grow,
And all reveal'd the beauteous Wanton plays.

The popularity enjoyed by these poems is further illustrated by the fact that, in 1739, another version of the second Lapp song appeared in the *Miscellaneous Works* of Mrs Elizabeth Rowe[1]. It figures here under the title *A Laplander's song to his mistress* and runs thus:

Shine out, resplendent God of day,
On my fair Orramoor;
Her charms thy most propitious ray,
And kindest looks allure.

In mountain, vale, or gloomy grove,
I'd climb the tallest tree,
Could I from thence my absent love,
My charming rover see.

I'd venture on a rising cloud,
Aloft in yielding air,
From that exalted station proud,
To view the smiling fair.

Should she in some sequester'd bow'r,
Among the branches hide,
I'd tear off ev'ry leaf and flow'r,
Till she was there descry'd.

From every bird I'd steal a wing
To Orramoor to fly;
And urg'd by love, would swiftly spring
Along the lightsome sky.

Return, and bless me with thy charms,
While yet the sun displays
His fairest beams, and kindly warms
Us with his vital rays.

---

[1] Vol. I, p. 92. She evidently follows the *Spectator* version, for she also takes 'Orramoor' to be the name of the girl.

Return before that light be gone,
    In which thou shouldst appear;
Unwelcome night is hast'ning on
    To darken half the year.

In vain, relentless maid, in vain
    Thou dost a youth forsake,
Whose love shall quickly o'er the plain,
    Thy savage flight o'ertake.

Should bars of steel my passage stay,
    They could not thee secure;
I'd thro' enchantments find a way
    To seize my Orramoor.

It is not uninteresting to find this northern influence making itself felt in English literature a generation before Gray's renderings from the Norse. But the chain is not yet complete. A later poet caught something of the romantic spirit underlying Scheffer's Lapp songs, for it was the second of them which inspired Longfellow's poem *My Lost Youth.* At the end of each stanza he makes use of a refrain, varying slightly from strophe to strophe, which at the end of st. 1 runs thus:

And a verse of a Lapland song
Is haunting my memory still:
'A boy's will is the wind's will,
And the thoughts of youth are long, long thoughts.'

Longfellow may have first of all read the song in the *Spectator* and, seeing the reference to Scheffer, gone to the original. But it seems almost more likely that his source was the German version in Herder's *Volkslieder*[1]. In any case, there can be no doubt that the ultimate source of his refrain is to be found in the words of *Lapponia*—'puerorum voluntas, voluntas venti; juvenum cogitationes, longæ cogitationes.'

It will perhaps not be out of place to add a few words as to the history of Scheffer's Lapp songs in other literatures. In Germany the popularity of *Lapponia* was considerable. The whole work was translated in 1675 and published at Frankfort on Main and Leipzig under the title *Joanni Schefferi...Lappland; das ist, neue und wahrhafftige Beschreibung von Lappland und dessen Einwohnern.* In particular the account of magic amongst the Lapps seems to have aroused attention. Hence we find a *Kurtzer Bericht von der Lappländer Zauber-Kunst, Hexerey und Wahrsagerey* published in 1674. This book, abridged and translated from Scheffer's *Lapponia* by E. Francisci, again appeared in 1695, 1711, 1717 and 1726. It came to be linked with the story of Dr Faustus and in the 1695 edition of G. R. Widmann's *Das ärgerliche Leben und schreckliche Ende des vielberüchtigten......Johannis Fausti...*, published at Nürnberg, we find an *Anhang von den Lapponischen Wahrsagerpaucken*, based on E. Francisci.

---

[1] See the account of the Lapp songs in Germany which follows.

As for the two Lapp songs, it was the second which proved the more popular. This song was mentioned by the seventeenth century poet Christian Hofmann von Hofmannswaldau, and Daniel Georg Morhof translated it into German. Coming to the eighteenth century we find it referred to by Friedrich von Hagedorn and imitated by Ewald von Kleist under the title of *Lied eines Lappländers*, this being based, according to Sauer, the editor of Kleist's works, on Mrs Rowe's version. The second Lapp song also attracted Herder. He referred to it in his *Auszug aus einem Briefwechsel über Ossian und die Lieder alter Völker* (1773), although at this time he was unacquainted with Scheffer and was relying on Morhof's *Unterricht von der deutschen Sprache und Poesie* (Kiel, 1682). However, when he translated it for the *Volkslieder*, he had read Scheffer's *Lapponia* and quoted several lines from this work. The song appears in the *Volkslieder*, Part II, Book ii, No. 5, under the title *Die Fahrt zur Geliebten.*

The first song was not nearly so well known in Germany. It was, however, translated by Herder in the *Volkslieder*, Part I, Book iii, No. 11, under the title *Ans Renntier.* A later version is that of von Halem in Voss's *Musenalmanach* for 1786 (p. 13). However, if these two Lapp songs have lived on in German literature, it is chiefly due to the renderings of Herder in the *Volkslieder* (1778–79)[1].

In Finland Scheffer's translation of the second Lapp song inspired the poet Frans Michael Franzén. Here and there in his didactic poem *Emili eller en afton i Lappland*, written 1798—1802, we find graceful lyrics, amongst these being *Spring, min snälla ren*, based on the reindeer song given by Scheffer[2]. A generation later comes Runeberg with his *Färden till den älskade*, a translation of Herder's *Die Fahrt zur Geliebten.* Finally mention should be made of the poem *Till rendjuret*, translated from Herder's *Ans Renntier*, and published in the *Fosterländskt Album* edited by Kellgren, Tengström and Tigerstedt (Helsingfors, 1847[3]).

In France the Lapp songs do not seem to have been so well known as in England and Germany. The French translation of Scheffer's *Lapponia* was made by the Père Augustin Lubin, and was published at

---

[1] Cf. Kürschner's *Deutsche National-Litteratur, Herders Werke*, I, ii, pp. 40—43.

[2] Cf. O. Donner, *Lieder der Lappen*, Helsingfors, 1876, and Schück and Warburg, *Illustrerad Svensk Litteraturhistoria*, 2nd ed., Vol. II, p. 554.

[3] Cf. R. Bergström's essay, p. 12 (vid. ante).

Paris in 1678 under the title *Histoire de la Laponie.* This version appears, however, to have been unknown to Voltaire when he spoke of the Lapp songs in 1729 in the preface to *Oedipe.* The dramatist is defending the use of rime and contends that it is almost universal. In this connexion he adds 'on trouve dans un des *Spectateurs* de M. Addison une traduction d'une ode laponne rimée, qui est pleine de sentiment.'

Passing to Holland we discover that the Dutch translation of *Lapponia* appeared at Amsterdam in 1682 under the title *Waarachtige en aen-merkenswaerdige historie van Lapland.* The song about the reindeer was translated by E. J. Potgieter in his *Poëzy,* 1827—1874 (II, 24, Haarlem, 1875). His translation, entitled *Laplandsch Liedje,* is, however, based on the Swedish-version of Franzén.

Such then is the history of the Lapp songs, and one cannot but feel some astonishment at the vogue which these humble songs of a remote and little-known people enjoyed in so many European countries. Certainly when Scheffer took them down from his Lapp student at Upsala, he could hardly have foreseen that their influence was destined to extend so far[1].

HERBERT WRIGHT.

BANGOR.

---

[1] I wish to thank Professor H. G. Fiedler, Professor Gustave Lanson and Professor G. Kalff, Rector of the University of Leyden, for the information they have very kindly given me about the Lapp songs in Germany, France and Holland respectively.

DANTE AND THE 'CURSUS':

A NEW ARGUMENT IN FAVOUR OF THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE 'QUAESTIO DE AQUA ET TERRA.'

As is well known to all who have followed the controversy concerning the authenticity of the *Quaestio de Aqua et Tèrra*, those who deny Dante's authorship of the treatise maintain that it is a forgery of the end of the fifteenth or beginning of the sixteenth century, most probably by Moncetti, the first editor, who published the work at Venice in 1508[1]. The arguments in favour of the genuineness of the treatise, which had previously been upheld in a paper read (in 1895) before the Oxford Dante Society by Dr C. L. Shadwell, have been stated with great force and ability by Dr Moore in his essay on the *Quaestio* in the second series of his *Studies in Dante*[2], in which he examined in detail the external and internal evidence *pro* and *con*, with the result that the burden of proof was effectually shifted on to the shoulders of the unbelievers. One line of enquiry, however, did not suggest itself to Dr Moore, nor has it, so far as I am aware, been followed by any of those who have hitherto concerned themselves with the question of the authenticity of the *Quaestio*[3]. It is with this line of enquiry that I propose to deal in the present paper.

Having had occasion lately to study the laws of the mediaeval *cursus* in connexion with the revision of the text of Dante's *Epistolae*, it occurred to me to apply the *cursus* test to Dante's other Latin works, the *De Monarchia* and the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, and finally to the *Quaestio de Aqua et Terra*. Before submitting the results of my application of the test, it will be convenient if I give a very brief account of the history and nature of the mediaeval *cursus*[4].

---

[1] See especially A. Luzio e R. Renier, *Il probabile falsificatore della Quaestio de Aqua et Terra*, in *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana* (1892), Vol. xx, pp. 125—50; and also Vincenzo Biagi, *La Quaestio de Aqua et Terra di Dante Alighieri* (Modena, 1907), pp. 17 ff.

[2] *The Genuineness of the Quaestio de Aqua et Terra*, pp. 303—56.

[3] Since this paper (which was read before the Oxford Dante Society in May, 1917) was written, a note on *La Quaestio de Aqua et Terra e il Cursus*, by E. G. Parodi, has been published in the *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana* (N.S. xxiv, 168—9).

[4] For this account I am indebted for the most part to the paper on *The Cursus in Mediaeval and Vulgar Latin* by Professor A. C. Clark (Oxford, 1910); to the second edition

The *cursus* is the name given to the harmonious arrangement, according to prescribed laws, of the words at the end of the clause or sentence in prose composition—'artificiosa dictionum structura,' as it is defined by a thirteenth century writer on the subject[1]. The mediaeval *cursus* may be described as the lineal descendant of the classical *cursus*, with the substitution of accent for quantity; that is to say, mediaeval Latin prose, when written in accordance with the laws of the *cursus*, was accentual or rhythmical, instead of being metrical, like the 'prosa numerosa' of Cicero. During the period of transition (usually reckoned to have extended from the latter half of the fourth century to the beginning of the seventh), before the stress of the accent had altogether obliterated the recognition of quantity, there prevailed a style which was characterized by a mixture of the two—*cursus mixtus*, as it has been called,—some of the clausulae being metrical, while others follow the accent without regard to the quantity[2]. At the end of this period the employment of rhythmical prose seems to have fallen into abeyance[3].

A revival took place in the eleventh century, when the rhythmical *cursus* was adopted by the Roman Curia and was the subject of elaborate rules[4]. 'The prose of this period,' writes Professor Clark, 'was largely epistolary'; in which term are included 'not merely private letters, but elaborate and courtly compositions sent to ecclesiastical dignitaries, and diplomatic documents proceeding from the Papal Chancery...The usual term for such compositions was *dictamen*[5], writers were called *dictatores*[6], their art was known as *ars dictatoria*, and handbooks giving the rules were styled *summa dictaminis*[7].'

The employment of the *cursus* soon spread beyond the confines of the

---

of *Il Cursus nella Storia Letteraria e nella Liturgia* of Angelo De Santi (Rome, 1903); and to chapter iv of R. L. Poole's *Lectures on the History of the Papal Chancery* (Cambridge, 1915).

[1] Buoncompagno di Firenze—the passage is quoted by Thurot in his *Histoire des Doctrines grammaticales au Moyen Âge* (in *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits*, XXII, ii, 480):—'Appositio que dicitur esse artificiosa dictionum structura, ideo a quibusdam cursus vocatur, quia, cum artificialiter dictiones locantur, currere sonitu delectabili per aures videntur cum beneplacito auditorum.'

[2] See Clark, *op. cit.*, pp. 10—13.

[3] See Clark, *op. cit.*, pp. 12—13, where the following statement of the Benedictines of Solesmes is quoted: 'A partir de Saint Grégoire le Grand le rythme semble s'exiler pour quatre siècles de la prose littéraire.' Cf. De Santi, *op. cit.*, p. 12: 'Tutti gli autori sono concordi nell' asserire che dal secolo VII in poi la prosa metrica va disparendo. A poco a poco la quantità soggiace all' impero dell' accento e più non conta, finchè si perde ogni traccia di un *cursus* comechessia cadenzato.'

[4] Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

[5] Dante applies this term to a poetical composition in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* (ii, 12, l. 52).

[6] Dante twice uses the word in this sense, viz., in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* (ii, 6, l. 46), and in the letter to Can Grande (*Epist.* x, l. 207).

[7] Clarke, *op. cit.*, pp. 13—14.

Papal Chancery, and became general, not only in epistolary correspondence, but in every form of Latin prose composition with any pretension to style and elegance[1],—its use in fact became the distinguishing mark of a cultivated writer,—and it continued to flourish until 'with the dawn of the Renaissance the knowledge of quantity revived, and the *cursus* was abandoned as barbarous[2]...and the art of *numerosa compositio* was lost, only to be recovered gradually during the last few years[3].'

---

[1] This is brought out in an interesting way by Dante in the sixth chapter of the second book of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, in which he enumerates four 'degrees of construction,' with instances: 'Sunt etenim gradus constructionum quamplures; videlicet insipidus, qui est rudium, ut *Petrus amat multum dominam Bertam.* Est pure sapidus, qui est rigidorum scholarium vel magistrorum, ut *Piget me cunctis pietate maiore quicumque in exilio tabescentes, patriam tantum somniando revisunt.* Est et sapidus et venustus, qui est quorundam superficie tenus rhetoricam haurientium, ut *Laudabilis discretio marchionis Estensis et sua magnificentia praeparata cunctis illum facit esse dilectum.* Est et sapidus et venustus, etiam et excelsus, qui est dictatorum illustrium, ut *Eiecta maxima parte florum de sinu tuo, Florentia, nequicquam Trinacriam Totila secundus adivit*' (ll. 32—48). In the three last examples, which are those of a cultivated style, the normal rules of the *cursus* are observed, while in the first, 'qui est rudium,' they are ignored. Thus in the second we have '(pie)táte maióre' (*planus*); '(in ex)ílio tàbescéntes (*velox*), '(somni)ándo revísunt' (*planus*); in the third, '(marchi)ónis Esténsis' (*planus*), '(magnifi)céntia praèparáta' (*velox*), 'ésse diléctum' (*planus*); in the last, 'túo, Floréntia' (*tardus*), '(ne)quícquam Trinácriam' (*tardus*), '(se)cúndus adívit' (*planus*). It may be noted that the *cursus* is also observed in the example which Dante gives, earlier in this same chapter, in the passage in which he defines the 'constructio': 'Est enim sciendum, quod constructionem vocamus regulatam compaginem dictionum, ut *Aristoteles philosophatus est tempore Alexandri*' (ll. 11—14), 'témpore Àlexándri' constituting a *velox*.

[2] Thus Coluccio Salutati, in a letter (quoted by Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 21) written in 1403 to Jacopo da Teramo, Bishop of Florence, in reply to one from the Bishop in which the *cursus* was avoided, expresses himself as follows: 'Cum omnia placeant, super omnia michi gratum est, quod more fratrum ille sermo rythmica lubricatione non ludit. Non est ibi syllabarum equalitas, que sine dinumeratione fieri non solet; non sunt ibi clausule, que similiter desinant aut cadant, quod a Cicerone nostro non aliter reprehenditur quam puerile quiddam*, quod minime deceat rebus seriis vel ab hominibus qui graves sint adhiberi. Benedictus Deus, quod sermonem unum vidimus hoc fermento non contaminatum et qui legi possit sine concentu et effeminata consonantia cantilena!' (ed. Novati, iii, 631—2). This was not the only occasion on which Coluccio manifested his contempt for the *cursus*. Writing in 1369 to Marino Ceccoli da Perugia, who also rejected the *cursus*, he says: 'Vidi, inquam, dictamen stilumque tuum, in quo non modernorum lubricatione iocaris, non religiosorum rythmica sonoritate orationem instruis, sed solido illo prisco more dicendi contentus, nil fucatum et maiore quam deceat apparatu comptum prefers' (ed. Novati, i, 77). To Benvenuto da Imola, the commentator on Dante, he writes in 1383: 'Quid recurris ad illos, qui ad mensuram et, quod apud Tullium nostrum puerile est, ex pari ferme numero sillabarum orationis membra distinguunt?' (ed. Novati, ii, 78). And to Frà Giovanni Dominici in 1406: '[Religiosi] rethoricam nichil aliud esse putant quam splendidorum vocabulorum congeriem, clausulis lubricantibus trisyllaboque cursu vel quadrisyllabo terminatis; quod quidem minimum est ad rethoricam tamen spectans, et quo Cicero, Sallustius, Livius et alii, qui cunctis prestantiores in eloquentia reputantur, sic usi sunt et raro, quod videantur et cursus et illa festivitas eos secuti non ab eis de industria vestigati' (ed. Novati, iv, 234).

[3] See N. Valois, *Étude sur le Rythme des Bulles Pontificales*, in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, XLII, 267; Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 21; and Poole, *op. cit.*, p. 76. Cf. De Santi, *op. cit.*, p. 33: 'Il massimo fiore del *cursus* letterario medievale si riscontra tra il pontificato d' Innocenzo III (1198–1216) e quello di Nicolò IV (1288–1292). Le regole rimangono invariate e nelle lettere pontificie non vi ha clausola, o intermedia o finale, che non sia regolata col *cursus*. Ma sotto Nicolò IV comincia la decadenza. I notarii apostolici

* The reference here, and in the letter to Benvenuto da Imola quoted below, is to *Ad Herennium*, IV, 20.

In the medieval *cursus*, which, it must be borne in mind, depends entirely upon accent, not quantity, and in which there is no elision, the hiatus being tolerated, three principal types of clausula are recognized, which are known respectively as *planus*, *tardus*, and *velox*.

Cursus Planus.

The *cursus planus* in its normal form (*pl*) consists of a paroxyton trisyllable (or its equivalent, a monosyllable and a paroxyton dissyllable) preceded by a paroxyton dissyllable or polysyllable, the caesura falling after the second syllable of the clausula; as, ésse | vidétur; víncla | perfrégit; lóngum | sermónem; dáre | non vúltis; (obe)díre | mandátis.

As in the classical *cursus* two short syllables might be substituted for a long syllable in the clausula[1], so in the mediaeval *cursus* it was allowable to substitute two unaccented syllables for one in the same manner, a licence which gave rise to what may be termed alternative or secondary forms. Thus the normal form of the *planus* (ésse vidétur; lóngum sermónem) might be replaced by a secondary form (pl^2), such as, ésse | videátur; dóna | sentiámus; (perve)níre | mereámur; the caesura falling after the second syllable as in the normal form[2].

Another variation of the normal *planus* was occasionally admitted, in which the whole clausula was composed of a single word (pl^3); such as, júdicabátur; tránsgrediéntes[3].

Yet another form, which by some is classed as a variety of *planus* (pl^4), and by others is placed in a separate category styled *cursus medius*[4], consists of a paroxyton dissyllable preceded by a proparoxyton trisyllable (or its equivalents) or polysyllable, the caesura falling after the third syllable of the clausula; as, précibus | nóstris; út pius | páter; (domi)nábitur | míhi[5].

Cursus Tardus.

The normal form of the *cursus tardus* (*t*) consists of a proparoxyton tetrasyllable (or its equivalents), preceded by a paroxyton dissyllable or

---

divengono di mano in mano più negligenti...Nel secolo XIV il *cursus* scompare del tutto nelle nuove Bolle e solo sopravvive nelle formole copiate dagli Atti più antichi, ma senza coscienza alcuna dello stile loro proprio. La rinascenza aveva fatto già rifiorire le teorie di Cicerone e di Quintiliano, ed i bravi latinisti del cinquecento non badarono più davvero alle regole del *cursus*, ma a scriver bene, secondo lo stile dell' Età dell' oro e a dare una movenza armonica al periodo che ritraesse del gusto dei migliori classici, a ciò aiutandosi specialmente del giudizio dell' orecchio formatosi sopra quelli.'

[1] Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[2] This secondary form is by some classed as *cursus trispondaicus*; see De Santi, *op. cit.*, p. 25; Clark, *op. cit.*, pp. 18, 19.

[3] See Parodi, in *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana*, N.S. XIX, 251 n.

[4] See De Santi, *op. cit.*, p. 26; and Clark, *op. cit.*, pp. 18, 19.

[5] See Parodi, *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.*, N.S. XIX, 251 n., 259.

polysyllable, the caesura falling after the second syllable of the clausula, as in the *planus*; as, ésse | vidébitis; víncla | perfrégerat; (oper)ári | justítiam. The final tetrasyllable may be represented either by a paroxyton trisyllable followed by a monosyllable; as, nóbis | aggréssus est; (sub)íre | necésse est; or by a proparoxyton trisyllable preceded by a monosyllable; as, vérba | non cáperent; (murmu)rántes | in ínvicem.

By the substitution, as in the *planus*, of two unaccented syllables for one after the caesura, we get a secondary form of the *tardus* (t^2), of the type ésse | videámini; (vir)tútis | operátio[1].

What by some is classed as a variety of the *cursus tardus* (t^3), and by others is placed in the category of the *cursus medius*[2], has the caesura after the third syllable of the clausula, which thus consists of a proparoxyton trisyllable preceded by a proparoxyton trisyllable or polysyllable; as, júgiter | póstulat; (per)cútitur | ímpius.

Cursus Velox.

The *cursus velox* in its normal form (v) consists of a paroxyton tetrasyllable (or its equivalents) preceded by a proparoxyton trisyllable or polysyllable, the caesura falling after the third syllable of the clausula; as, ómnia | vìdeántur; vínculum | frègerámus; flétibus | sùpplicántis; (su)súrrio | blàndiéntem[3]. The final tetrasyllable may be represented either by a paroxyton trisyllable preceded by a monosyllable; as, cívitas | est Romána; (vic)tóriam | sunt adépti; or by two dissyllables; as, nésciens | atque nólens; (uten)sília | Dei súmus.

As in the case of the *planus* and *tardus*, by substituting two unaccented syllables for one after the caesura, we get a secondary form of *velox* (v^2), of the type flétibus | ìntemerátus; cállide | cònsiderántes.

A further variety of the *cursus velox* (v^3), which by some is designated *cursus octosyllabicus*[4], has an additional syllable at the end, of the type flétibus | sùpplicántium; (amari)túdinem | poèniténtiae.

It may be noted in passing that the *cursus velox* (in its normal form) was by far the most popular of the three types of clausula in the mediaeval *cursus*, and was usually assigned the post of honour at the end of the period. De Santi quotes[5] an interesting dictum on this subject from one of the mediaeval text-books on *dictamen*, which, as he observes, enforces the point by example as well as by precept, the sentence ending with a sonorous *velox*: ‘Cursus tamen velox maiorem ornatum efficit, et ideo a dictatoribus commúniter àcceptátur.’

---

[1] This secondary form of *tardus* is by some classed as *dispondeus dactylicus*; see De Santi, *op. cit.*, p. 26; Clark, *op. cit.*, pp. 18, 19.

[2] See De Santi, *op. cit.*, p. 26; Clark, *op. cit.*, pp. 18, 19.

[3] The grave accent indicates a minor stress, in conformity with the observation 'that long words cannot be pronounced without the help of minor accents' (see Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 10).

[4] See De Santi, *op. cit.*, p. 26; Clark, *op. cit.*, pp. 18, 19.

[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 25.

For convenience of reference and comparison the three principal types of clausula in the mediaeval *cursus*, with their variations, as formulated above, are here tabulated with typical examples.

Cursus Planus.

(*a*)	∼́∼ | ∼∼́∼	ésse vidétur lóngum sermónem	(*pl*).
(*b*)	∼́∼ | ∼∼∼́∼	ésse videátur dóna sentiámus	(pl^2)[1].
(*c*)	∼́∼∼∼́∼	júdicabátur tránsgrediéntes	(pl^3).
(*d*)	∼́∼∼ | ∼́∼	précibus nóstris ímpius páter	(pl^4)[2].

Cursus Tardus.

(*a*)	∼́∼ | ∼∼́∼∼	ésse vidébitis ráro justítia	(*t*).
(*b*)	∼́∼ | ∼∼∼́∼∼	ésse videámini fórtis operátio	(t^2)[3].
(*c*)	∼́∼∼ | ∼́∼∼	júgiter póstulat cómmoda sítiens	(t^3)[4].

Cursus Velox.

(*a*)	∼́∼∼ | ∼̀∼∼́∼	flétibus sùpplicántis ómnia vìdeántur	(*v*).
(*b*)	∼́∼∼ | ∼̀∼∼∼́∼	flétibus ìntemerátus cállide cònsiderántes	(v^2).
(*c*)	∼́∼∼ | ∼̀∼∼́∼∼	flétibus sùpplicántium tímidae vìdeámini	(v^3)[5].

We may now consider the *cursus* in connection with the *Quaestio*. By the end of the fifteenth century, or beginning of the sixteenth, the date at which the treatise is alleged to have been forged, as we have seen, the practice of the *cursus* had long been abandoned, and its very existence forgotten[1].

---

[1] Designated by some *cursus trispondaicus* (see above, p. 423, n. 2).
[2] By some classed as a type of *cursus medius* (see above, p. 423).
[3] Designated by some *cursus dispondeus dactylicus* (see above, p. 424, n. 1).
[4] By some classed as a type of *cursus medius* (see above, p. 424).
[5] Designated by some *cursus octosyllabicus* (see above, p. 424).

In view of the consensus of opinion on the subject, this statement hardly calls for proof here, but if confirmation be needed it may be found in the fact that in the *Epistolarium, seu de arte conficiendi epistolas opus* of Giovanni Mario Filelfo (1426–1480),—a sort of 'polite letter-writer,' which had an immense vogue in the fifteenth century, during which no less than eight editions were printed,—the *cursus* is absolutely ignored[2]; as it is also in Moncetti's dedicatory letter to the Cardinal Hippolito da Este, which he prefixed to the original edition of the *Quaestio*[3]. If, therefore, it can be shown that the rules of the *cursus* are observed in the *Quaestio*, the presumption must be admitted to be strongly in favour of the conclusion that the treatise cannot be a forgery of the fifteenth or sixteenth century, when the *cursus* and its observance had passed into oblivion. It is of course not inconceivable that a preternaturally clever forger of that period may have rediscovered for himself the rules of the *cursus*, and have conformed to them accordingly for the purpose of adding verisimilitude to his falsification. But in that case we should have expected him in his editorial capacity to draw attention to the point, in order to ensure that his laborious introduction of this particular feature should not be thrown away on the public whom it was his object to deceive. Such a hypothesis, however, is in the circumstances hardly deserving of consideration, and it may be dismissed without hesitation. It is not without significance in this connection that in some undoubted Dante forgeries of the fifteenth century which happen to have come down to us the *cursus* is not observed. These are the alleged beginnings of Dante's *De Monarchia* and *De Vulgari Eloquentia,* as well as of sundry Latin letters, which were inserted in his *Vita Dantis* (written in or before 1467) by the same Filelfo whose *Epistolarium* has just been referred to. If Filelfo had been acquainted with the *cursus* and with the fact that it was habitually observed by the writers of Dante's day, he would hardly have failed to have himself observed it in his alleged extracts from Dante's works[1]. That he did not do so may be accepted as conclusive proof of his ignorance.

---

[1] See above, p. 422, and n. 3.

[2] A couple of extracts taken at haphazard from the *Epistolarium* will suffice to demonstrate this: '*Titulus* XXIX. *Doctrinalis familiaris.* Quod me ames aequum est. Amaris enim ab me supra modum. Sed ne prolixitate verborum tempus teram, cum sententiarum potius opificem quam verborum sapientem esse decere doceat Augustinus, ad ea summatim respondebo quae postulasti. Perpetuitate utuntur vel observatores latinae linguae in iis quae ad philosophiam attinent, siquidem commodiore vocabulo ea sententia nequit exprimi. Ut enim ab aeterno formata aeternitas, sic a perpetuo perpetuitas...'—'*Titulus* XI. *Commotiva ad pacem familiaris.* Eo fungar officio, quod Salvator nos docuit inquiens: In quamcunque domum intraveritis dicite, Pax huic domui. Quamobrem et Romani templum constituere pacis, et apud Juvenalem est: ut colitur pax atque fides. Quin etiam Plato, quod usurpavit Tullius, pacem atque concordiam duo dixit rerum publicarum fundamenta. Vos igitur, humanissimi principes, hortor ad pacem. Satis pugnatum est. Satis cruoris effusum. Satis admissum injuriarum....' Though, as is naturally to be expected in any piece of Latin prose composition, there are occasional clausulae here which correspond with those of the mediaeval *cursus*, it is obvious that these are purely accidental. The accidental occurrence of such clausulae may be observed even in the very passages in his letters in which Coluccio Salutati is condemning the *cursus* (see the extracts given above, p. 422, n. 2).

[3] The following are the opening sentences of Moncetti's letter: 'Bracteata Graecorum sententia fertur, Reverendissime Antistes, qua monemur, nihil dulcius quam omnia scire. Unde dictum est ab Homero Mantuano, omnium rerum saturitas est, praeter quam scire; deinde sententia memoratu digna a principe peripatheticorum dicitur, omnes homines natura scire desiderant. Huius peripatheci (*sic*) praecepta emulatis. Ideo summo praeconio voceque nectarea usque ad sedes Ioviales es extollendus. Quoddam virtutis specimen ineffabile ex te manat, quia a tenella aetate bonis disciplinis moribusque polliticis es eruditus. Catoni Porcio, Hortensio es equiparandus, qui reipublicae Romanae fulgura micantia fuerunt...'

Before we proceed to the demonstration of the *cursus* test as applied to the *Quaestio,* it must be explained that we must not expect to find the *cursus* observed in the purely argumentative portions of the treatise, in which of necessity technical terms have to be introduced which do not easily lend themselves to the required manipulation; its observance must only be looked for in the more rhetorical and personal passages. This will be found to be the case also in Dante's *De Monarchia* and *De Vulgari Eloquentia,* in which the strict observance of the *cursus* is confined for the most part to the introductory chapters; as well as in the letter to Can Grande (*Epist.* X), the *cursus* being regularly observed in the address and first four sections, which constitute the epistolary portions proper[2], but not in the remainder of the letter, which is in the nature of a commentary, and full of technical terms and quotations[3].

---

[1] The passage in the *Vita Dantis* containing these alleged extracts is as follows; 'Romano quidem stilo edidit opus, cui *Monarchiae* dedit nomen, cuius hoc est principium: *Magnitudo eius, qui sedens in throno cunctis dominatur, in coelo stans omnia videt, nusquam exclusus, nullibi est inclusus, ita dividit gratia munera, ut mutos aliquando faciat loqui.* Edidit et opus *de Vulgari Eloquentia* hoc principio: *Ut Romana lingua in totum est orbem nobilitata terrarum, ita nostri cupiunt nobilitare suam; proptereaque difficilius est hodie recte nostra quam perite latina quidquam dicere.* Edidit et epistolas innumerabiles; aliam cuius est hoc principium ad invictissimum Hunnorum regem: *Magna de te fama in omnes dissipata, rex dignissime, coegit me indignum exponere manum calamo, et ad tuam humanitatem accedere.* Aliam, cuius est initium rursus ad Bonifacium Pontificem Maximum: *Beatitudinis tuae sanctitas nihil potest cogitare pollutum, quae vices in terris gerens Christi, totius est misericordiae sedes, verae pietatis exemplum, summae religionis apex.* Aliam, qua filium alloquitur, qui Bononiae aberat, cuius hoc est principium: *Scientia, mi fili, coronat homines, et eos contentos reddit, quam cupiunt sapientes, negligunt insipientes, honorant boni, vituperant mali*' (Ed. 1828, pp. 110—14). Here again there are sundry clausulae which correspond with those of the *cursus*, but, as in the case of the letters of Salutati quoted above, they are obviously accidental (see p. 426, n. 2).

[2] See Parodi, in *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.*, N.S., XIX, 273.

[3] Exceptions of a similar nature, it may be observed, covering titles, dates, quotations, and technical phraseology generally, were formally recognised in the rules of the *cursus* of the Roman Curia (see Valois, *Étude sur le Rythme des Bulles Pontificales*, in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, XLII, 258; and Poole, *op. cit.*, pp. 80, 94).

The non-argumentative portions of the *Quaestio* are the proem or address, the first section, which is introductory, and the last, which records the place, circumstances, and date of the discussion. Now, taking the text as revised by Dr Shadwell, and printed in the third edition of the *Oxford Dante* (1894), we find—

In the proem: (uni)vérsis et síngulis (*t*)[1]; lítteras ìnspectúris (*v*); (in) éo salútem (*pl*); (veri)tátis et lúmen (*pl*).

In § 1: (exis)ténte me Mántuae (*t*); quaédam exórta est (*t*); (dila)táta multóties (*t*); (indetermi)náta restábat (*pl*); (a)móre veritátis (pl^2); (con)tínue sim nutrítus (*v*); (quaesti)ónem praefátam (*pl*); línquere ìndiscússam (*v*); vérum osténdere (*t*); cóntra dissólvere (*t*); (veri)tátis amóre (*pl*); ódio fàlsitátis (*v*); lívor multórum (*pl*); (con)fíngere sólent (pl^4); dícta transmútent (*pl*); plácuit ínsuper (t^3); dígitis èxaráta (*v*); á me relínquere (*t*); cálamo dèsignáre (*v*). In this section the *velox* is employed no less than five times, and in each case it seems intended to emphasise a particular point—'continue sim nutritus' (l. 6); 'linquere indiscussam' (l. 8); 'odio falsitatis' (l. 11); 'digitis exarata' (l. 16); 'calamo designare' (l. 18).

In § 24 we have: phílosophía (pl^3)[2]; (sacro)sáncto Románo (*pl*); úrbe Veróna (*pl*); Hélenae glòriósae (*v*); cléro Veronénsi (pl^2); (cari)táte ardéntes (*pl*); (ro)gámina non admíttunt (*v*); (humili)tátis virtútem (*pl*); (pro)báre videántur (pl^2); (inter)ésse refúgiunt (*t*); nátivitátem (pl^3); ínnuit vènerándum (*v*); (Ianu)áriis Ídibus (t^3); (Ka)léndas Februárias (t^2).

It may be remarked that the writer of the treatise was evidently thoroughly imbued with the *cursus*, and accustomed to its use, for, consciously or unconsciously, he is continually introducing *cursus* endings even in the argumentative portions, especially at the end of a section—note, for example, the endings of § 2, (ha)bére videbántur (pl^2); § 3, véro exclúdi (*pl*); § 8, (su)périus tàngebátur (*v*); § 9, (su)périus pràenotáta (*v*); § 12, déstrui dèbebátur (*v*); §§ 13, 19, órdine dìcendórum (*v*); § 17, (ap)párens et non exístens (*v*). Also we find in the same parts of the treatise numerous instances of the *velox*, employed apparently more or less for the sake of emphasis; e.g. in § 2, (habi)tábilem àppellámus; in § 3, (ab) ómnibus cònfirmátur; in § 4, (nobi)líssimo còntinénti; in § 11, tália ínvenìre; in § 12, (rideret Aris)tóteles si audíret; in § 15, ípsius Àmphitrítis; (descen)déntia màniféstant; in § 18, ímpetu rètrahúntur; in § 19, (dis)tántia tèrminórum[1].

---

[1] For the explanation of these abbreviations, see the Table on p. 425.

[2] *Philosophia*, and many other words in *-ia* of Greek origin, according to mediaeval usage were paroxyton (see my *Dante Studies and Researches*, p. 102 n. 4; and Thurot, *Notices et Extraits de divers manuscrits latins pour servir à l'histoire des doctrines grammaticales au moyen âge*, p. 406, in *Notices et Extraits*, XXXII, 2). That Dante so accented *philosophia*, *prophetia*, and *monarchia*, is proved by the *cursus* in the following passages, viz. (philoso)phíae doméstico (*t*) (*Epist.* IX, 32); dígitum pròphetíae (*v*) (*Epist.* VI, 186); (apos)tólicae mònarchíae (*v*) (*Epist.* VI, 53). Of *monarchía* we have a well-known instance in the first line of the epitaph of Dante, 'Jura Monarchiae, Superos, Phlegetonta, lacusque.'

We have now to show that Dante observed the *cursus*, with the reservations above mentioned, in the *De Monarchia* and *De Vulgari Eloquentia*. In the first chapter of the first book of the *De Monarchia* we find, (inter)ésse vidétur (*pl*); (anti)quórum ditáti sunt (*t*); pósteris pròlabórent (*v*); hábeat quo ditétur (*v*); ésse non dúbitet (*t*); (docu)méntis imbútus (*pl*); (ad)férre non cúrat (*pl*); (pernici)ósa vorágo (*pl*); sémper ingúrgitans (*t*); (ingurgi)táta refúndens (*pl*); mécum recógitans (*t*); (quan)dóque redárguar (*t*); (non) módo turgéscere (*t*); (fructifi)cáre desídero (*t*); (os)téndere vèritátes (*v*); íterum dèmonstráret (*v*); (reos)téndere cònarétur (*v*); (a Cice)róne defénsam (*pl*); (re)súmeret dèfensándam (*v*); (taedi)ósa praestáret (*pl*); (oc)cúltas et útiles (*t*); màxime látens (pl^4); (immedi)áte ad lúcrum (*pl*); (ab) ómnibus ìntentáta (*v*); (enucle)áre latíbulis (*t*); múndo pervígilem (*t*); glóriam àdipíscar (*v*); víres aggrédior (*t*); (vir)túte confídens (*pl*); (largi)tóris illíus (*pl*).

In the first chapter of the first book of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* we have, (inveni)ámus tractásse (*pl*); (neces)sáriam vìdeámus (*v*); (na)túra permíttit (*pl*); (luci)dáre illórum (*pl*); ámbulant per platéas (*v*); (posteri)óra putántes (*pl*); (aspi)ránte de coélis (*pl*); (prod)ésse tentábimus (*t*); nóstri ingénii (*t*); póculum haùriéntes (*v*); (compi)lándo ab áliis (*t*); (poti)óra miscéntes (*pl*); (potio)náre possémus (*pl*); (dul)císsimum hỳdroméllum (*v*); and so on to the end of the chapter, which is wound up with a *velox*, (in)téntio pèrtractáre.

As in the case of the *Quaestio* and of *Epist.* x, so in the argumentative portions of the *De Monarchia* and *De Vulgari Eloquentia* the occurrence of *cursus* clausulae is frequent. This is noticeable in many of the section and chapter endings of both works[2]; as well as in occasional passages of some length in which the observance of the *cursus* is sustained throughout[1]. In both works also we find numerous instances of the similar use of the 'emphatic' *velox*[2].

---

[1] The same points are noticeable in the expository portions of *Epist.* x—see the endings of §§ 6 (*pl*), 7 (*pl*), 11 (*v*), 13 (*v*), 15 (pl^3), 16 (*v*), 19 (*v*), 21 (*pl*), 28 (*v*), 29 (*t*), 30 (*pl*), 32 (*pl*), 33 (*v*); conspicuous instances of the *velox*, apart from other *cursus* endings, in the same portions of the letter are glóriae lìbertátem (l. 154); (ar)bítrii lìbertátem (ll. 174, 241); cómparent aùditóris (l. 305); gaúdia Pàradísi (l. 337); pótuit rètinére (l. 346); (auc)tóritas màniféstat (l. 353); (es)séntiae et virtútis (l. 399); pénetrat et respléndet (l. 429); córpora ùnivérsa (l. 444); (in) saécula saèculórum (l. 628).

[2] See for instance the chapter endings of *Mon.* i, 3 (*v*), 4 (*v*), 5 (*t*), 8 (*v*), 12 (*pl*), 16 (*pl*); ii, 1 (*t*), 2 (*pl*), 3 (*pl*), 4 (*t*), 8 (*t*), 10 (*pl*), 12 (*pl*); iii, 1 (*pl*), 2 (*pl*), 3 (*t*), 4 (*t*), 5 (*pl*), 8 (*v*), 9 (*v*), 10 (*v*), 14 (*t*), 16 (*v*); and of *V.E.* i, 1 (*v*), 2 (*pl*), 3 (*t*), 4 (t^3), 5 (*t*), 8 (*pl*), 9 (*pl*), 12 (*v*), 13 (*pl*), 14 (*pl*), 15 (*pl*), 16 (*v*), 17 (*pl*), 18 (*v*); ii, 1 (*v*), 2 (*v*), 4 (*v*), 5 (*v*), 6 (*v*), 7 (*t*), 8 (*t*), 9 (*pl*), 10 (*v*), 11 (*t*), 13 (*t*).

It is evident, then, that the author of the *Quaestio* follows the same principles and practice with regard to the *cursus* as does Dante in his undisputed Latin works[3]. It may be claimed, therefore, that the result of the application of the *cursus* test to the treatise furnishes, as it were by a side wind, a remarkable confirmation of the conclusion arrived at on wholly independent grounds by Dr Moore, namely, that the *Quaestio de Aqua et Terra*, 'though corrupted possibly in some of its details,' is 'in all essential points the production of the same mind and pen to which we owe the *Divina Commedia*, the *De Monarchia*, and the *Convivio*' —and, as we may now add, the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* and the *Epistolae*.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.

---

[1] For example, in *Mon.* ii, 3, ll. 1—42; ii, 5, ll. 31—42; iii, 16, ll. 75—113; and in *V.E.* i, 5, ll. 10—34; i, 6, ll. 17—38; i, 7, ll. 1—70; i, 8, ll. 1—44; i, 9, ll. 1—107; &c., &c. It may be mentioned that the observance of the *cursus* is more noticeable in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* than in the *De Monarchia*.

[2] For example, to quote but a few out of the many instances, in *Mon.* i, 4, l. 44, (manifes)tíssimam vèritátem; ii, 1, l. 25, (in hoc) único còncordántes; ii, 3, l. 32, (in me)móriam sèmpitérnam; ii, 4, l. 49, (con)córditer còntestántur; and in *V.E.* i, 7, l. 38, (memor)ábili càstigávit; i, 8, l. 28, (o)céano lìmitátur; i, 9, l. 89, várie vàriétur; i, 10, l. 20, (his)tóriae ac doctrínae; i, 12, l. 58, túrpiter bàrbarízant; &c.

[3] The observance of the *cursus* in Dante's *Epistolae* has only been touched on incidentally in the present paper, the subject having been treated more or less fully by several other writers; see, for example, Parodi's article *Intorno al Testo delle Epistole di Dante e al Cursus*, in *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.*, N.S. xix, 249—75 (Dec. 1912).

RABELAIS' LISTS OF FOWLS, FISHES, SERPENTS AND WILD BEASTS.

(IV, 59, 60, 64; V, 30.)

To the *Viandier* or Cookery-book of Taillevent, the great fourteenth century cook, are appended four specimens of *banquets* given by great nobles. They consist of four *mestz*, or courses, in which may be remarked the small amount of butcher's meat and the large number of swans, peacocks, pigeons, game-birds and water-fowl that are served. This seems to be the rule at such functions. There was also in each *banquet* a course of dishes of confectionery with much sugar.

In the same way Rabelais provides for his ventripotent God (*Gaster*) an ordinary *banquet* (IV, 59) and a lenten one (IV, 60), each of four courses, offered to him by Manducus the high-priest and the Gastrolaters who follow in his train. Unfortunately in the 59th chapter Fezandat, the printer, has arranged the important third course, in parallel columns indeed, but without observing the necessity of presenting the dishes in the form of a responsive litany, in which similar dishes are placed in opposite columns. It is proposed here to arrange the course so as to observe this. It can be done by means of slight transpositions.

Omitting the first four *pièces de résistance* in each column, nearly all the other dishes consist of fowls—mostly water-fowls—and it may be observed that twenty-seven of the fowls served here have already made part of the supper provided by Grandgousier in *Garg.* c. 37. In this *banquet* Rabelais would seem to have drawn upon his own knowledge and observation for the long list of water-fowl served. The rivers and marshes in Chinonais abounded in game of this kind and the region was much resorted to by hawking parties. There are also to be found in Rabelais' 'books' many indications of his acquaintance with the details of falconry.

The dishes are arranged in the following columns in a manner suited to the correspondence proper to each pair.

Esclanches à l'aillade,	Espaulles de mouton aux cappres,
Pastez à la saulse chaulde,	Pièces de boeuf royalles,
Coustelettes de porc à l'oignonnade,	Poictrines de veau,
Chappons roustiz avecque leur degout,	Poulles bouillies et gras chappons au blanc manger,
Hutaudeaux,	Poulletz,

Becars, Cabirotz,
Bischars, Dains,
Lievres, Levraulx,
Perdris, Perdriaux,
Faisans, Faisandeaux,
Pans, Panneaux,
Ciguoignes, Ciguoigneaux,
Becasses, Becassins,
Hortolans,
Cocqs, poulles et poulletz d'Inde,
Ramiers, Ramerotz,
Cochons au moust,
Canards à la dodine,
Merles,
Poulles d'eaue,
Tadournes,
Aigrettes,
Cercelles,
Butors, palles,
Courlis,
Plongeons,
Gelinottes de boys,
Rasles,
Connils,
Gelinottes,
Risses, Chevreaulx,
Lappins, Lapperaulx,
Cailles, Cailletaux,
Pigeons, Pigeonnaux,
Herons, Heronneaux,
Otardes, Otardeaux,
Pluviers,
Becfigues,
Guynettes,
Bizets,
Oyes, Oyzons,
Foulques aux pourreaux,
Maulvys,
Hallebrans,
Pochecuillières,
Courtes, Grues,
Tyransons,
Flamans, Cygnes,
Corbigeaux,
Francouris,
Tourterelles,
Girardines,
Porcepicz.

In the list given here there is a difficulty in the line *Becars, Cabirotz.* The meaning of *becard* is disputed. Cotgrave translates it 'the female salmon,' and Rondelet, who is Rabelais' great authority on fishes, supports him thus: *Salmo*...Praeterea marem a femina distinguunt; hanc enim ob rostrum magis aduncum hami modo *Becard* appellant (*de piscibus fluviatilibus* I, 2).

M. Sainéan in the *Revue du XVIème Siècle* (which is an enlarged continuation of the *Revue des études Rabelaisiennes*), vol. IV, p. 273, pronounces *becard* to be *le grand harle*, i.e. the *mergus merganser.* Although a salmon seems out of place in such a list, I incline to think that Rondelet should be followed, simply because he is the usual authority for Rabelais in such matters.

The word *Risses* also presents the difficulty that no one seems to know what it is. Le Duchat and Lacroix guess that it is another name for *chevrettes*, i.e. the feminine of *chevraulx*. M. Sainéan (*R. E. R.* X, 466) suggests that it means *rouge-gorge*, but I do not think a small ordinary bird would find place in such a *banquet*.

In the eighth line from the bottom on the right-hand side we find *courtes, grues.* Of *courtes* I can find no account whatever in French zoological or other dictionaries. Perhaps it is a dittography of *courlis* lower down.

Cabirotz would seem to be the Provençal for *kid.* Cf. *cabirotade* (IV, 20). *Guynettes* is guinea-hens (*R. E. R.* XIV, 278).

Rabelais, lib. iv, c. 60.

In the second course of the lenten *banquet* are 88 fishes of all kinds and sizes. The names are taken almost entirely from Pliny, lib. ix, and Rondelet *de piscibus*. Rondelet was the Montpellier professor whom Rabelais scoffs at in iii, 31—34. Pierre Gilles also had included in his translation and adaptation of Aelian a book on Fishes. From this also a few items are taken. Though Aelian is mentioned by Rabelais (*G.* 23, 36, v. 30) he is actually only very little employed by him. With very few exceptions the extracts from Aelian come through Gilles, who was a naturalist and traveller in Greece in the time of Francis I (1490–1555). He was born at Albi in Languedoc and has sometimes been called 'the father of French Zoology' (Tilley). The title of his book, of which a beautiful edition was published by Seb. Gryphius at Lyons in 1533, is: Ex Aeliani historia per Petrum Gyllium latine facti, itemque ex Porphyrio, Heliodoro, Oppiano, tum eodem Gyllio luculentis accessionibus, libri xvi de vi et natura animantium. Ejusdem Gyllii liber unus de Gallicis et Latinis nominibus piscium (Lugd. Seb. Gryph. 1533). A dozen of the fish in Rabelais' list may be found in Ausonius' *Mosella*, 85—148.

List of Fishes.

Lamproyes, P. 9, 74, *lampetra* R. xiv, 3
Barbeaulx,
Barbillons, G. *pisc.* 68
Meuilles, *mugil* P. 9, 59
Meuilletz, R. *fluv.* 18
Baleines, P. 9, 12, R. xvi, 12
Macquereaulx, *scomber* P. 9, 49, R. viii, 7
Pucelles (pilchards, or small shad), R.E.R. xiv, 277
Rayes, P. 9, 78, *raia asteria* R. xii, 12
Casserons, P. 9, 52, *loligo parva* R. xvii, 5
Esturgeons, *acipenser* P. 9, 60, R. xiv, 9
Plyes, P. 9, 72, *passer rhombi figura* R. xi, 7
Huystres frittes, P. 9, 168, R. *test.* i, 36
Pectoncles, P. 9, 84, R. *test.* i, 16
Langoustes, P. 9, 95, *lucusta* R. xviii, 2
Espelans, R. *fluv.* 21
Gourneaulx, gurnard (Cotg.)
Truites, R. *fluv.* 4
Lavaretz, R. *palust.* 16
Guodepies,
Poulpres, P. 9, 87, *polypus* R. xvii, 6
Limandes, *passer asper*, P. 9, 72, R. xi, 9
Carreletz, *passer quadrata* R. xi, 8
Maigres, R.E.R. xiv, 274
Pageaux, *erythinus* R. v, 16
Gougeons, *gobio* P. 9, 175, R. *fluv.* 31 and vi, 16
Barbues, *rhombus laevis* R. xi, 3.
Cradotz, river bream (Littré).
Carpes, *cyprinus*, R. *lacust.* 4
Brochetz, P. 9, 57, *lucius* R. *fluv.* 4
Palamides, P. 9, 84, R. viii, 10
Roussettes, P. 9, 151, R. xiii, 7 (*canicula Aristot.*)
Oursins, P. 9, 100, R. xviii, 29 *echinus*
Vielles, *turdus* P. 9, 52, R. vi, 6
Ortigues, *urtica* P. 9, 146, R. xvii, 14
Crespions, P. 9, 155 (*araneus*)
Gracieux Seigneurs
Empereurs (*xiphias*), P. 9, 54, G. 113, R. viii, 15
Anges de mer, R. xii, 21, G. 49, *squatina* P. 9, 75
Lampreons, R. *fluv.* 24
Lancerons, jegs, pickerel (Cotg.)
Brochetons, R. *fluv.* 13, *lucius*
Carpions, R. *lacust.* 12
Carpeaux, R. *lacust.* 12
Saulmons, P. 9, 68, R. *fluv.* 1
Saulmonneaux, R. *fluv.* 2
Daulphins, P. 9, 20, *marsouins* R. xvi, 8
Porcilles, *porculus marinus* P. 9, 45, R. xiii, 10

Turbotz, *rhombus*, P. 9, 72, R. xi, 2
Pocheteau, *passer* G. 45
Soles, *buglossus* P. 9, 72, R. xi, 11
Poles, *cynoglossus* R. xi, 13
Moules, *musculi* P. 9, 179, R. (*test.*) 44
Homars, *astacus* P. 9, 97, *ast. gammarus* R. xviii, 3
Chevrettes, prawns (Cotg.), R.E.R. xiv, 270
Dards, *leuciscus* R. *fluv.* 17
Ablettes, *alburnus* R. *fluv.* 33
Tanches, R. *lacust.* 10
Umbres, grayling, R. *fluv.* 5
Merluz frays, *asellus* P. 9, 58, R. ix, 9
Seiches, *sepia* P. 9, 52, R. xvii, 2
Rippes, sticklebacks (Cotg.)
Tons, P. 9, 35, R. viii, 10
Guoyons, *gobio* R. *fluv.* 31
Meusniers (chub), *cottus gobio* R. *fluv.* 25
Escrevisses, *astacus-fluv.*, R. *fluv.* 35
Palourdes, *conchula varia* R. *test.* 27
Liguombeaulx, Langoustes
Chatouilles,
Congres, P. 9, 57, R. xiv, 1
Oyes (porpoise), P. 9, 61
Lubines (λάβραξ), P. 9, 57, R. ix, 7
Aloses, *thrissa* R. vii, 15
Murenes, P. 9, 45, R. xiv, 5
Umbrettes, cf. Umbra
Darceaux, cf. Dards
Anguilles, P. 9, 74, R. *fluv.* 23
Anguillettes, R. *fluv.* 23
Tortues, *testudo coriacea*, P. 9, 35, R. xvi, 4
Serpens, i.e. Anguilles de boys, R. xiv, 7
Dorades, *aurata* P. 9, 58, R. v, 2
Poullardes, (*cuculus*) *gallina* G. 62
Perches, P. 9, 57, R. vi, 8, *fluv.* 22
Realz (? Royal sturgeons)
Loches, *aphya cobites*, R. *stag. mar.* 11
Cancres, P. 9, 97, R. xviii, 13
Escargotz, P. 9, 173, R. *fluv.* 42
Grenoilles, P. 9, 159, R. *palust.* 1

The special remarks of Pierre Gilles on a few of the fishes may be given here:

Cap. 68. *Barbus* ex eo nomen duxit quod similiter ut Mullorum natio barbatulus est: hujus enim inferius labrum genuinis pilis utrimque ornatur.

Cap. 6. Ego *Capitoleum* arbitror Balenam ex eo potius quam Orcam esse quod Graeci etiam nunc vocant *φαλαίνην* quam vulgo appellamus Capitoleum.

Ausonius distinguishes between the *balena* Atlantiaca and the balena Mosellae (l. 148) which seems to be not a whale, but some huge fish caught in the French rivers and known as *Gibbar*.

Empereurs, cap. 113. Xiphias (gladius), Massilienses *Imperatorem* piscem vocant.

Anges de mer, cap. 49. Squatinam Massilienses *Angelum* appellant.

Ligombeaulx, cap. 73. *de Astaco.* Theodorus *cammarum* convertit. Massilienses *Leonem* et *Astacum* ex Plinio diversos pisces *Ligombaudos* nominant.

Poullardes, cap. 62. *Coccyx* sive *cuculus*, Massilienses eum Gallinam appellant.

Gaudepies have not been identified.

For a few of the fish in the list Cotgrave furnishes equivalents:

Pucelles, river pilchards (or a little shad-fish).

Maigre, a great and skalie fish with a wattle on his chin.

Gracieux seigneur, a skalesse fish of a long form, ever cleaving to the rocks.

Rippes, sticklebacks.

Chatouilles, a certain fish full of small bones.

Realz, a kind of the best sturgeon.

RABELAIS, LIB. IV, C. 64.

The list of 98 serpents and other noxious creatures is taken from the *Theriaca* of Nicander, the poet-priest of Colophon (185–35 B.C.), from lib. IX of Pierre Gilles's edition of Aelian and other writers, with additions of his own, from a number of serpents recorded by Avicenna, the Arabic physician and philosopher, in the 3rd, 4th, and 5th books of his *Canon*, and from Pliny's 29th book, which is mainly devoted to the lizard tribe. Besides these contributions there are a few stray specimens from other sources. The 8th book of Pliny mentions many of the serpents in common with Gilles, but the latter seems to be the authority followed by Rabelais in these particulars.

The *Theriaca* is interesting, as having furnished many writers with materials on this subject. Lucan in his description of Cato's march across the African desert, which was infested with serpents, poetically attributes the origin of these plagues to the blood dropped from the head of Medusa as Perseus was carrying it off in the air over these districts. Dante borrows a few of Lucan's 18 snake-names in the *Inferno*, XXIV, 85—90. Avicenna has translated several of Nicander's serpents into Arabic. They have been preserved more or less correctly by Gerard of Cremona in his translation into Latin, and adopted later by Pulci in his *Morgante Maggiore*, lib. XXV, *sub fin.* One couplet will suffice in illustration,

> E andrio, edissimon e arbatraffa,
> E non si recordo de la giraffa.

The Arabic names with interpretations may be found in 'l'indispensable Dictionnaire de Cotgrave.'

Many of the venomous creatures in Rabelais' list are spoken of by Ambroise Paré, who describes them and their poisonous bites and the antidotes to them, lib. XXIII, cc. 13—43.

Aspicz G. IX, 28
Amphisbenes G. IX, 44
Anerudutes (?Ammodutes) Avic. IV, 6. 3. 49
Abedissimons Av. IV, 6. 3. 54
Alhartafs Av. IV, 6. 3. 57
Ammobates Aelian. *N.A.* VI, 51
Apimaos
Alhatrabans Av. III, 1. 4. 21
Aractes (Aracis) Av. IV, 6. 3. 46
Asterions P. 29, 86. Nic. *Th.* 735
Alcharates Av. IV, 6. 3. 40

Arges Hippoc. *Epid.* V, § 86
Araines (*de mer*) P. 9, 155
Ascalabes Nic. *Th.* 484
Attelabes P. 29, 92
Ascalabotes P. 29, 90
Aemorrhoïdes G. IX, 43
Basiliscz *G.* IX, 18
Belettes ictides P. 29, 60
Boies P. 29, 122
Buprestes 29, 95, G. IV, 49
Cantharides P. 29, 93, Nic. *Th.* 755
Chenilles (Lat. *erucae*) P. 17, 229
Crocodilles G. IX, 29
Crapaulx (*rubeta*) G. VIII, 21
Catoblepes G. VII, 1
Cerates G. IX, 37
Cauquemares
Chiens enraigez P. 29, 88
Colotes P. 29, 90
Cychriodes, Strabo IX, 393
Cafezates Av. IV, 6. 3. 40
Cauhares (prop. *Caubares*) Av. V, 11
Couleffres (*coluber*) P. 29, 32
Cuharsces Av. IV, 6. 3. 49
Chelhydres G. IX, 42
Craniocolaptes Schol. in Nic. *Th.* 964
Chersydres P. 22, 18, Nic. *Th.* 359
Cenchrynes G. IX, 36, Nic. *Th.* 463
Coquatris
Dipsades G. IX, 46
Domeses
Dryinades G. IX, 42
Dracons P. 29, 67, G. IX, 11
Elopes G. XI, 21, *pisc.* 21
Enhydrides P. 32, 102
Fanuises (*Famuses*) Av. IV, 6. 3. 57
Galeotes P. 29, 90
Harmenes Av. IV, 6. 3. 23
Handons Av. IV, 6. 3. 57
Icles ? the *bocca mele* of Sardinia
Jarraries ? *Algerarat* Av. V, 4
Ilicines = Dryinades G. IX, 42 (*ilex*)
Ichneumones G. VII, 15
Kesudures = Andrio, Av. IV, 6. 3. 29
Lievres marins P. 29, 104, G. *pisc.* 53
Lizars chalcidiques = Sepes P. 29, 102, G. IX, 55
Myopes Nic. *Th.* 417
Manticores G. VII, 2
Molures Nic. *Th.* 491
Myagres Nic. *Th.* 490
Musaraines P. 29, 88, G. VIII, 39
Miliares = Cenchris, Av. IV, 6. 3. 44
Megalaunes
Ptyades P. 28, 65
Porphyres G. IX, 57
Pareades G. IX, 56
Phalanges P. 29, 84, G. VIII, 34
Pemphredones Nic. *Th.* 872
Pityocampes P. 29, 95
Ruteles Av. V, 5, cf. Galen *loc. aff.* IV, 7
Rimoires ? = Rimatrix (R.E.R.)
Rhagions P. 29, 84
Rhaganes
Salamandres P. 29, 74, G. IX, 61
Scytales G. IX, 52, Av. IV, 6. 3. 45
Stellions P. 29, 90
Scorpenes P. 32, 151 } Rond.
Scorpions P. 29, 91, G. VIII, 40 } VI, 19
Selsirs Av. IV, 6. 3. 51 (= Sepes)
Sclavotins P. 29, 90, Arist. *Nub.* 170
Solofuidarz P. 29, 92
Sourds Av. IV, 6. 3. 25 = toad R.E.R. XIV, 275
Sangsues P. 28, 160
Salfuges P. 29, 92
Solifuges P. 29, 92
Sepes P. 29, 102, G. IX, 54
Stinces (*Scinci* P. 28, 119) (crocod. terrestris)
Stuphes
Sabtins = sabrins Av. = *Haemorrhoïs*
Sangles
Sepedons Nic. *Th.* 242
Scolopendres Nic. *Th.* 812
Tarantoles = *Chalcidice* R.E.R. XIV, 264
Typhlopes Nic. *Th.* 492
Tetragnates P. 29, 87
Teristales (Triscalis) Av. IV, 6. 3. 47
Viperes P. 29, 69, G. IX, 29—35

Of the serpents that have not been fully identified the following is the list:

Apimaos is from the τυφλῶπες ἀπήμαντοι (= harmless), Nic. *Th.* l. 492.

Cauquemare is the *Incubus* or Nightmare, personified, as in IV Anc. Prol. and Pant. Prog. c. 6.

Coquatris is the same animal as the Basilisk.

Cychriodes is the Κυχρείδης ὄφις, the serpent of Kychreus, said by Hesiod to have been driven out by Eurylochus and to have become the *famulus* of Demeter at Eleusis (Strabo IX, 393).

Domeses I would conjecture is from a mistaken interpretation of Nic. *Theriaca* 153, ἄλλος δ' αὖ κόχλοισι δόμην ἰνδάλλεται αἴης, 'another in his body (δόμην = δέμας) resembles an earth-snail.' Rabelais seems to have made δόμην the accusative of δόμης, which he supposed was the name of a serpent.

Stuphes is quite unknown.

Sangle according to Littré is the common name in La Vendée for the green and yellow snake *Zamenis viridiflavus.*

Megalauni have not been identified. M. Sainéan conjectures the μελάνουρος of Aelian. I had referred to Gilles *de Pisc.*, c. 12, on the same word.

Rabelais, V, 30.

Rabelais' debt to Gilles will best be shewn by a list of the beasts and birds mentioned, with the references to his book. In one or two instances Aelian, *Nat. An.*, seems to have been consulted.

Elephant Ael. II, 11, G. I, 1
Rhinoceros Ael. XVII, 44, G. V, 24
Unicorn Ael. III, 41, P. 8, 73
Chamaeleon G. VII, 4
Hydra G. IX, 47
Phoenix Lactantius *de Phoenice* (Gryph. 1548), P. 10, 3
Pelicans G. XV, 47
Cinnamologi P. 10, 97, G. XV, 29
Tinnunculi P. 10, 109, G. XV, 15
Onocrotals (= Pelicans) Plin. 10, 131
Stymphalides G. XVI, 19
Harpae G. XV, 55
Pardalis, seu Panthera, G. II, 20
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text{Dorcades}\\ \text{Cemades}\end{array}\right\}$ G. VI, 26
Werwolves P. 8, 80
Onocentaurs Ael. XVII, 9
Tigers G. V, 28
Leopards G. II, 20
Hyenas G. V, 26
Camelopardalis G. V, 23
Oryx G. V, 28
Cynocephali G. VI, 48—50
Satyri G. VI, 51
Seleucides P. 10, 75, G. XVI, 17
Caprimulgi P. 16, 115, G. XV, 13
Argatiles P. 10, 96
Cartozoni G. VII, 3
Tarandus G. VII, 5
Uri G. VII, 6
Halces (MS.) G. VII, 7
Monopes G. VII, 8
Poephagi G. VII, 9
Cepi G. VII, 10
Neades G. VII, 11
Subus (MS. Gebes) G. VII, 12
Cercopitheci G. VII, 24
Bisontes G. IV, 44
Musimons G. VI, 43
Biuri (MS.) P. 30, 146
Ophions (MS.) P. 30, 146
Stryges P. 11, 232
Griffins G. XIV, 11

Rabelais, lib. V, c. 30.

If *centaurs* be read instead of *onocentaurs* Rabelais' source would most probably be Galen *de us. part.*, III, 1, where is a careful description of the *Centaur.*

In the list given above (col. 2, line 8 from bottom) *Subus* occurs in Gilles VII, 12, immediately following *Neades*, G. VII, 11. The edition of 1564 reads *Steres* and the MS. *Gebes.* The true reading is probably *Cebus*, a platyrhine ape in Aristot. *h. a.* II, 8. 1. 502^{a}. 16.

The passage describing the *remora* or echeneïs is certainly taken from Pliny 9, 80 and Gilles *pisc.* 58; the 'mackerel and poisonous *remoras'* are derived from Plin. 9, 79, 'echeneïs amatoriis veneficiis infamis et judiciorum ac litium mora.' Budaeus has this in view in his *Forensia* when he writes *Remorae forenses*, dilationes aliae super alias impetratae. Est enim piscis remora...de qua Plinius.

The remaining animals in this chapter are:

Sphynxes G. VII, 13, *Raphes* and *Cephi* P. 8, 70, *Lynxes* P. 8, 72.
Crocutae G. V, 29, P. 8, 72, *Eali* and *Leucocrutae* P. 8, 73.
Vultures dicunt non nidificare G. XIV, 12, P. 10, 19.
Mantichores G. VII, 2, P. 8, 75.
Catoblepon G. VII, 1, P. 8, 77, 'quiconque les voit meurt soudainement comme qui verroit un basilic.' eadem et basilisci serpentis est vis, P. 8, 78.
Cinclus quam *motacillam* appellare possumus, G. V, 29.

W. F. SMITH.

BATH.

GRIMAREST'S LIFE OF MOLIERE.

It was Anaïs Bazin in his *Notes historiques sur la vie de Molière*[1] who first called in question the trustworthiness of Grimarest as a biographer of Molière, pointing out his numerous mistakes. For many years after this Grimarest was looked on with suspicion, and in 1877 Brunetière described his book as 'a collection of improbable anecdotes, picked up from every quarter, in which not a date is correct, and not a statement bears the impress of truth[2].' But in the same year a more favourable view was expressed by Jules Loiseleur[3].' 'It is the fashion now-a-days,' he says, 'to decry Grimarest....The truth is that he wrote from information supplied him by Baron, whom Molière had trained and brought up in his household, and that he was enlightened on several points by the poet's family....He should certainly be consulted with precaution and discernment; we must give up many suspicious anecdotes, and bring the light of a vigilant criticism to bear on his whole narrative; but he is of high value when the facts that he relates are in accord either with probability or with authentic documents, and especially when he claims to have got them from Molière's relations or friends.' A somewhat similar line is taken by Paul Mesnard in the careful and exhaustive biographical notice which forms volume X (1889) of the *Œuvres de Molière* in the series of *Les Grands Écrivains de la France*[4]. 'Behind Grimarest it is well to see those who gave him his information; the value of his *Life of Molière* depends chiefly on the sources that were open to him.' That is said in the spirit of true criticism. We must first investigate Grimarest's sources. But the value of his book also depends on the use that he made of those sources. We must therefore go on to test his accuracy.

Of Grimarest himself we know very little. He is described in the privilege of his book as Jean-Leonor le Gallois, Sieur de Grimarest.

---

[1] These notes first appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for July 15, 1847 and January 15, 1848, and in book form in 1849. After the author's death (1850) a second edition revised by the author and considerably enlarged was published by Paulin Paris in 1851.

[2] *Études critiques*, vol. 1.

[3] *Les points obscurs de la vie de Molière*, 1877.

[4] I must express here my debt not only to this volume, but to the whole work. The most careful and trustworthy biography of Molière in English is that by H. M. Trollope, 1905.

He was born at Paris in 1658 or 1659 and died there in 1713[1]. He was therefore only a boy at the time of Molière's death. By profession he was a teacher of languages and a *cicerone.* His first literary work, *Commerce de lettres curieuses et savantes,* appeared in 1700, and he wrote a poor history of the campaigns of Charles XII of Sweden, a treatise on recitation, and another on the writing of letters.

La Vie de M^r^ de Molière was published in 1705, the privilege being dated January 11 of that year. In a letter to Claude Brossette, dated March 12, 1706, Boileau speaks of it in the following uncomplimentary terms: 'Pour ce qui est de la vie de Molière franchement ce n'est pas un ouvrage qui mérite qu'on en parle. Il est fait par un homme qui ne savait rien de la vie de Molière et il se trompe dans tout, ne sachant pas même les faits que tout le monde sait[2].' This has been described as a *boutade*, but it is at any rate a deliberate statement in a letter, nor is there any appearance that Boileau, as has been suggested, was out of temper when he wrote it. Let us however examine Grimarest for ourselves. And first, as to his sources.

'J'en ai eu plus de peine à développer la vérité,' he says in one of his introductory paragraphs, 'mais je la rends sur des Mémoires très-assurez[3],' and we do not need his positive statement to that effect in his *Réponse à la critique* to know that the *Mémoires,* by which we must understand written notes, were furnished by the actor, Baron. For quite a considerable portion of the *Life* consists of stories in which Baron plays a leading part. For instance, the story of Raisin and the spinet, which, as Grimarest naively says, 'n'est pas tout-à-fait de mon sujet,' is evidently told because it redounds to Baron's credit[4], and it is followed by a long account of Baron's first connexion with Molière's company[5]. From another story we learn how Baron showed compassion to a poor comedian named Mondorge and how he persuaded Molière to give him pecuniary assistance[6].

Michel Boyron, known as Baron, was born in October, 1653. He was twelve years old when Molière took him under his protection, and thirteen when he played the part of Myrtil in *Mélicerte.* After this he left Molière's company for a time, and did not join it again till 1670. As is well known, he was a great favourite with Molière and lived in his house. But the association was limited to the years 1665–1666 and 1670–1673, and at the time of Molière's death he was only nineteen. He developed into a great actor both in tragic and comic parts, and success increased his natural propensity to egotism and vanity. These failings come out in the stories which he contributed to Grimarest's *Life*, though perhaps such touches as 'Ils [Molière's company] n'avaient point encore Baron pour rappeler le public,' and 'Ce n'est pas qu'il [Molière] eût universellement l'éloquence du corps en partage, comme Baron,' and 'Qui depuis sa mort a soutenu plus souvent le Théâtre comique que Monsieur Baron?' may be set down to Grimarest's friendship for his informant[1].

---

[1] A. Jal, *Dictionnaire critique de biographie et d'histoire.*

[2] *Correspondance entre Boileau-Despréaux et Brossette,* ed. A. Laverdet, 1858, p. 214.

[3] *La Vie de M^r^ de Molière,* p. 2. My references are to the re-impression of the original edition printed at Paris in 1877 with a notice by A. P. Malassis.

[4] *Ib.* pp. 44—48.

[5] *Ib.* pp. 48—57.

[6] *Ib.* pp. 65—67.

Baron was not only vain and egotistic, but according to his friend J.-B. Rousseau he was given to drawing the long bow. In a letter to Brossette in which Rousseau criticises 'cette miserable vie de Molière' (referring to Grimarest's *Life*) he says, "Celui [le témoignage] de notre cher Baron peut être fort bon à certains égards, mais vous l'avez connu et vous savez que le talent qu'il avait de peindre emportait quelquefois son imagination au delà des bornes du vrai. L'auteur de la prétendue vie de Molière a trop consulté notre ami et trop peu sa raison, et...il a fait d'un seul coup un des plus faux et des plus ennuyeux romans qui aient jamais paru[2].' This is a severe judgement, and in part at any rate unmerited, for Grimarest may be untrustworthy, but he is quite readable.

In his answer Brossette, who was collecting notes for a commentary on Molière, which is unfortunately lost, says that though he has obtained much valuable information (*grandes lumières*) from conversations with Baron he has not adopted without reserve all that he told him. 'J'ai su distinguer les circonstances qui ne servaient que pour l'ornement et qui etaient, pour ainsi dire, les fleurs de son imagination. J'avais d'ailleurs une règle pour juger de son exactitude: c'était quand ce qu'il me racontait se trouvait conforme à ce que j'avais appris ou de M. Despréaux ou de quelque autre témoin digne de foi....Quant à la vie de Molière écrite par M. de Grimarest, je conviens qu'elle mérite d'être supprimée[3].'

The only other source besides Baron whom Grimarest refers to by name is Racine. 'J'ai cependant entendu parler à M^r^ R[acine] fort avantageusement de Molière, et c'est de lui que je tiens une bonne partie des choses que j'ai rapportées[1].' Racine died in 1699, more than five years before the publication of the *Life*, but he may have spoken of Molière in conversation with Grimarest, without the latter having formed at that time any express intention of writing his life. But Grimarest himself says that he cannot find that Molière was on terms of intimacy (*a eu un commerce particulier*) with Racine. And then he mentions how Racine promised *B*[*ritannicus*] to Molière for his theatre and how after it was announced he transferred it to the Hôtel de Bourgogne[2]. This is a puzzling statement. We know that in December 1665 Racine's play of *Alexandre*, after its fourth performance at the Palais-Royal, suddenly appeared on the boards of the rival company, where, according to Louis Racine, it found better interpreters. But did Racine repeat his offence with *Britannicus*, or has Grimarest, which is far more likely, confused the two plays? He has another story about Molière and Racine, which is on the face of it highly suspicious. According to him Molière suggested the subject of his first tragedy, *La Thébaïde*, told him to bring an act to him every week, expressed dissatisfaction with his work as being largely borrowed from Rotrou, and finally helped him to alter what he had written and to finish the play. This is all very unlikely, and there is no trace of it in Racine's correspondence[3]. It follows that we must accept with considerable reserve Grimarest's statement as to the information that he had received from Racine. Further, we must bear in mind that after the breach at the end of 1665 Molière and Racine, though the breach was healed, were never again on intimate terms, that even before this date the intimacy was never close, and that the acquaintance did not begin till the latter half, at the earliest, of 1663. On the other hand Racine and Molière had common friends in Chapelle and Boileau, and some of the stories which Grimarest relates, especially those in which Chapelle plays a part, may have come originally from either of these and have been passed on by Racine to Grimarest.

---

[1] *Je suis ami de Baron* (*Addition à la Vie de M^r de Molière. Contenant une réponse à la critique que l'on a faite*, 1706).

[2] March 16, 1731. *Correspondance de Jean-Baptiste Rousseau et de Brossette*, ed. P. Bonnefon for the *Société des textes français modernes*, II, 40.

[3] *Ib.* pp. 43—44.

But Grimarest did not trust entirely to Baron and Racine. In a letter which he wrote to M. de Lamoignon, the First President of the *Parlement* of Paris, with reference to certain words which Molière was alleged to have addressed to the public after the President had forbidden the performance of *Tartuffe* in August 1667, he says, 'More than twenty persons have assured me that the incident took place almost as I have related it[1].' And in the *Réponse* he declares that 'Baron n'a pas plus de part à mon travail que plusieurs autres personnages dignes de foi, qui m'ont fourni des mémoires[2].'

---

[1] *Vie*, p. 150. Brossette was born in 1671 and J.-B. Rousseau in 1670.
[2] *Ib.* p. 149.
[3] See Racine, *Œuvres*, ed. P. Mesnard (Grands Écrivains de la France), I, 369 ff.

Finally in discussing the question whether Molière was ever admitted to the bar, he says that he was positively assured of the fact by 'his family.' To whom does he refer? Molière's younger brother died in 1660, leaving one son; his sister Madeleine in 1665, leaving two sons. She was the wife of André Boudet, who died about 1675[3]. Mme Molière, who in 1677 married an actor named Guérin, died in 1700. Molière's only surviving child, Madeleine, married in 1705, when she was forty, the Sieur de Montalant, and died in 1723. The terms in which Grimarest speaks of her—'Mademoiselle Poquelin fait connaître par l'arrangement de sa conduite et par la solidité et l'agrément de sa conversation, qu'elle a moins hérité des biens de son père, que de ses bonnes qualités[4]'—imply that he was acquainted with her. We may therefore infer that she was one of his sources of information. But she was only a child of six at the time of her father's death. Grimarest may also have consulted Molière's widow, but she died five years before his book was published.

Having considered Grimarest's sources, let us now see what use he made of them. We will begin with the times and places of production of Molière's plays, for here we can control him with certainty. To begin with, he says that *L'Étourdi*, Molière's first regular comedy, was produced at Lyons in 1653[5]. This is accepted by some authorities, but according to the register of Lagrange the real date is 1655[6]. Among the comedies produced in the provinces Grimarest includes *Les Précieuses ridicules*[7], but it is practically certain that this was first presented at Paris. He gives the date of the production of *Sganarelle ou le Cocu imaginaire* as March 28, 1660, but March is a mistake for May[8]. He says that *Les Fâcheux* was produced at the Court[9], whereas everyone knows that it was produced at Vaux for Fouquet's great *fête* in honour of the king. '*L'École des Femmes*,' says Grimarest, 'parut en 1662 avec peu de succès[10].' This is a flagrant error. The receipts from the first performance were very good—over 1500 *livres*—and the piece had for those days a highly successful run of sixty-three performances (three a week), which were only interrupted by the Easter holidays. After saying, correctly, that *La Princesse d'Élide* was presented at the great *fête* given at Versailles in May 1664, Grimarest adds that *Le Mariage forcé* was produced on the last day of the same *fête*, and that it did not find favour with the courtiers. As a matter of fact it was first performed at the Louvre in the private apartments of Anne of Austria in January 1664 and was very well received.

---

[1] *Vie*, p. 14. [2] *Ib.* p. 216.
[3] E. Soulié, *Recherches sur Molière et sa famille*, 1863.
[4] *Vie*, p. 58. [5] *Ib.* p. 12.
[6] La Grange and Vinot say 'Il vint à Lyon en 1653, et ce fut là qu'il exposa au public sa première comédie; c'est celle de *L'Étourdi*.' This does not necessarily imply that it was produced in 1653.
[7] *Vie*, pp. 13 and 19. [8] *Ib.* p. 21. [9] *Ib.* p. 24.
[10] *Ib.* p. 27.

Grimarest's account of *Tartuffe* is for a wonder quite correct[1]. His information that the first two performances of the complete play were given at Le Raincy, the *château* of the Princess Palatine, doubtless came from the 1682 edition of Molière's works, where this is explicitly stated. This makes it all the more extraordinary that he should not have consulted this edition for the dates of all the plays. It may be added that Grimarest is the source for the often quoted saying of Condé with regard to Scaramouche and Molière. It is misleading to say of *Don Juan* that 'on en fit dans le temps une très mauvaise critique[2].' It is true that it was hotly attacked by Molière's enemies, especially by the ultra-devout, but it found great favour with the general public, the receipts on one occasion reaching 2390 *livres*, and it was not from want of success that Molière withdrew it after the Easter vacation.

The account of *L'Avare* is full of errors. 'A peine fut-il representé sept fois. La prose dérouta ce Public. "Comment!" disoit M. le Duc de... "Molière est-il fou, et nous prend-il pour des benests, de nous faire essuyer cinq Actes de prose? A-t'on jamais vu plus d'extravagance? Le moyen d'etre diverti par de la prose!" Mais Molière fut bien vengé de ce Public injuste et ignorant quelques années après: il donna son *Avare* pour la seconde fois le 9e Septembre 1668. On y fut en foule et il fut joué presque toute l'année[3].' But this was really the date of the first representation. It it true, however, that the comedy was not at first appreciated. On the second day the receipts dropped to less than 500 *livres*, and it was withdrawn after the ninth performance. Towards the end of the year it was reintroduced with no greater success, but it was played in every succeeding year of Molière's lifetime, and in 1672 the receipts showed a marked improvement.

Grimarest is not more fortunate in his account of *Le Misanthrope*. He says that the first representation was not a success, and that Molière recognising this at once began to write *Le Médecin malgré lui* to support it (*le soutenir*); that the second representation was even less successful than the first, and the third than the second. At the fourth performance he gave with it *Le Médecin malgré lui*, which made his *bourgeois* public laugh. They found *Le Misanthrope* much better than they had supposed, and the two pieces together attracted the crowd as well as the connoisseurs. Molière was then emboldened to give *Le Misanthrope* alone, and the result was highly successful. This is Grimarest's story[1]. Now for the facts. *Le Misanthrope* was not it is true among the most successful of Molière's comedies, but the receipts for the first performance were 1447 *livres*, for the second 1617 *livres*, and for the third 886 *livres*. It was not till the twenty-second performance that it was accompanied by *Le Médecin malgré lui*, when the receipts came to 973 *livres*.

---

[1] *Ib.* pp. 94—95.

[2] *Ib.* p. 40.

[3] *Ib.* p. 58.

Grimarest accounts for the fact that Molière began to write his *Fagotier* (as he calls it) after the first performance of *Le Misanthrope* and completed it in time for the fourth, which allows only seven days for the writing and rehearsal of the play, by saying that it was one of those little pieces that the company had played almost extempore (*sur le champ*) in the early days of their existence. Molière therefore *n'avoit qu'à transcrire*. This is far from accurate. It is true that as early as 1661 a farce called *Le Fagotier* is recorded in the annals of the Palais-Royal, that in 1663 presumably the same farce appears under the name of *Le Fagoteux*, and that in 1664 we hear of *Le Médecin pàr force*, which is in all probability another name for the same farce[2], and this farce, it may be fairly assumed, was a first sketch of *Le Médecin malgré lui*. But the transformation from this sketch to the play as we have it must have been considerable. The Sganarelle of *Le Médecin malgré lui* is a great character, only inferior to the greatest of Molière's creations.

The story which Grimarest tells about Molière and Benserade in connexion with the verses in the ballet of *Les Amants Magnifiques* has no doubt a foundation in fact, for it is also told, though differently, by the Abbé Tallemand, but the part played by Benserade in Grimarest's version is inconceivable.

According to Grimarest no play was ever so badly received as *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme* when it was presented at Chambord. Then he relates how the courtiers criticised it severely (*la mettoient en morceaux*), and how five days elapsed before it was presented a second time, and how Molière, bitterly mortified, remained in his room, and how he sent Baron on voyages of discovery and how Baron always brought him back bad news. *Toute la cour étoit révoltée.* Meanwhile the king had not said a word to Molière about his comedy, but after the second performance he sent for him, and told him that he had not spoken before because he was afraid that he had been biassed by the excellence of the representation, 'mais en vérité, Molière, vous n'avez encore rien fait qui m'ait plus diverti, et votre pièce est excellente.' Thereupon Molière was overwhelmed with compliments by the courtiers, and a certain Duke, who had been loudest in dispraise of the comedy after the first performance, now said, 'That man is inimitable; there is a *vis comica* in all he writes, that the ancients have never equalled[1].' This is an excellent story, for which apparently Baron was the authority, but it does not agree with either the figures or the facts. This must have been one of the occasions on which Baron's imagination carried him 'au delà des bornes du vrai.'

---

[1] *Ib.* p. 99.

[2] In the register of La Grange under the dates October 7 and 9, 1679, *le Fagotier* again appears. This must be *Le Médecin malgré lui*, but the name of the old farce still stuck to it.

Grimarest's account of *Les Femmes Savantes* is still more erroneous. He says that it would probably have been a failure, if His Majesty had not shown Molière the same kindness about it as he had about *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme.* As in the case of the latter play he represents the king as saying nothing after the first performance but as praising it after the second, which was given at Saint-Cloud[2]. There is hardly a word of truth in this. *Les Femmes Savantes* was produced at the *Palais-Royal* on March 11, 1672 (not May 11), and was from the first successful. It was played at Saint-Cloud before the king's brother in August of that year and once only before the king, namely at Versailles on September 17, 'admirée d'un chacun.'

Grimarest says that both *Les Fourberies de Scapin* and *La Comtesse d'Escarbagnas* were both severely censured by good judges and persons of delicate taste, but that the public, for whom Molière wrote them, came in crowds and were delighted. We know that Boileau did not approve of *Les Fourberies de Scapin,* and it is essentially a popular play; but *La Comtesse d'Escarbagnas,* which is a *comédie-ballet,* was written for the court, and though it is little more than a sketch, it is not a farce but a social comedy of a refined type[3]. Moreover Grimarest gives a wrong date for its production, saying that it was first presented at the Court in February 1672, and at Paris on the 8th of July. The date of February is taken from the 1682 edition of Molière's works, but the first performance was really on December 2, 1671. Finally, Grimarest gives the wrong year for the production of *Psyché*, namely 1672 instead of 1671, and he says that it was during the *third* performance of *Le Malade imaginaire* that Molière was seized with his fatal illness, whereas it was really the fourth.

---

[1] *Ib.* pp. 141—143.

[2] *Ib.* pp. 146—147.

[3] Again at p. 165 Grimarest treats *La Comtesse d'Escarbagnas* as a farce.

All these mistakes as to the dates and places of production of Molière's plays, and as to their success or want of success, lead to the conclusion that Grimarest was both careless and inaccurate. He took no pains to obtain the best information and he blundered over such information as he had. He might have defended himself by alleging that he was chiefly concerned, not with Molière's writings, but with his life. He does in fact say something of this sort, 'Je me suis donc renfermé dans les faits qui ont donné occasion aux principales actions de sa vie; et qui m'ont aidé à faire connaître son caractère, et les différentes situations où il s'est trouvé.' He had apparently written his book partly in order to contradict the calumnies and false statements with which Molière's memory was assailed after his death, especially those which had appeared in *Le Portrait du Peintre* (by Boursault) and *Élomire hypocondre.* Let us then take Grimarest at his word and see how he deals with 'the principal actions of Molière's life' and with such incidents and circumstances as tend to throw light on his character.

Grimarest's information about Molière's early years is extremely defective. To begin with, he says—or at least implies—that at the time of his birth his parents lived in a house 'under the pillars of the Halles[1],' whereas their real habitation, as Louis Beffara, the ex-commissioner of police, discovered, was a house at the corner of the Rue Saint-Honoré and the Rue des Vieilles-Étuves, known as the *Maison des Singes.* It was not till 1633, after his second marriage, that Jean Poquelin bought the house under the pillars of the Halles, the house in which he died. Next Grimarest says that the maiden name of Molière's mother was Boudet[2], whereas it was Cressé. This is a bad mistake, for Madeleine Poquelin could have told him what her grandmother's name was. It makes us sceptical about the truth of the story that Molière's grandfather used to take him to the play and inspired him with a distaste for the profession of upholsterer.

It is very doubtful whether Cyrano de Bergerac was a companion of Chapelle, Bernier, and Molière in their studies under Gassendi[3]. It is possible that Molière said with reference to his borrowings from Cyrano, 'Il m'est permis de reprendre mon bien où je le trouve.' But we are again rendered sceptical by the vagueness of Grimarest's knowledge, for he speaks of Molière's introducing into his plays 'several thoughts which Cyrano had formerly employed,' whereas the debt really consists of the well-known incident of the galley in *Les Fourberies de Scapin*, which Molière took from *Le Pedant joué*[1]. One story, that of the ecclesiastic who was sent by Molière's family to try and dissuade him from his intention of becoming an actor and who was himself converted by Molière's eloquence into becoming an actor, which is related by Charles Perrault in his *Hommes illustres*, is rejected by Grimarest as an invention[2], yet it is not a whit more absurd than some of those which he confidently relates, as for instance, the following. Molière, he says, translated nearly the whole of Lucretius, partly into verse and partly into prose, but one of his servants—'Molière n'etait point heureux en domestiques'—having taken one of the quires to use for curl papers for his master's wig, he was so furious that he flung the rest of the translation into the fire. One may well hesitate to accept this improbable story, and as a matter of fact it is a much disputed question whether Molière ever did more than translate certain passages of Lucretius[3]. At any rate nothing now remains of the translation but the free paraphrase of sixteen lines which appears in the second act of *Le Misanthrope*. As to the question whether Molière was admitted as an advocate, Grimarest says that the fact 'was absolutely denied by persons who he supposed knew the truth better than the general public,' but that his family assured him of the contrary, and that they supported their assertion by a story of how Molière and a fellow-student of law became one an advocate and the other an actor, and how each was successful in his profession, and how when the whim seized Molière to leave the bar for the stage his friend the actor became an advocate. This is of course an absurd story, for Molière certainly never practised at the bar, but according to La Grange and Vinot he studied law for a time—'Au sortir des Écoles de Droit il choisit la profession de comedien'—and in *Élomire hypocondre* he is represented as saying:

---

[1] *Vie*, p. 3.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Vie*, pp. 7—8.

> Puis venu d'Orléans, où je pris mes licences,
> Je me fis advocat au retour des vacances[4].

---

[1] *Hommes illustres qui ont paru en France pendant ce siècle*, Paris, 1697; reprinted in *Molière jugé par ses contemporains*.

[2] *Vie*, pp. 9—10.

[3] For the evidence—a letter of Chapelain to Bernier, a note by Brossette on Boileau's Second Satire, and the prefaces to the second (1659) and third edition (1677) of the Abbé de Marolles's translation of Lucretius—see Molière, *Œuvres* v, 558—561.

[4] *Elomire hypocondre ou Les Médecins Vengez*, Paris, 1670. The author, Le Boulanger de Chalussay, though full of malice, is not badly informed as to Molière's early life. In the pirated edition published in Holland in 1671 the title is *Élomire c'est à dire Molière, &c.*

The story of Molière practising at the bar totally disagrees with what Grimarest tells us in the early pages of the *Life*, where he says that Molière, after completing his studies, on account of his father's *great age* took his turn as *valet de chambre* and *tapissier* to the king, and that his attendance at the Court did not make him lose his taste for the stage. Then immediately afterwards he relates how he and his friends founded the *Illustre Théâtre*. We may take it on the authority of La Grange and Vinot that Molière, at least on one occasion, performed his father's duties at the Court and before he renounced the succession in favour of his brother (January, 1643), and there is evidence which tends to confirm Grimarest's statement that he accompanied Louis XIII to Narbonne[1]. But to speak of his father's *great age* is a gross error, for Jean Poquelin was only forty-seven in the year 1642, and as he did not die till 1669, Grimarest might easily have ascertained the truth about his age from his granddaughter.

In spite of the *témoignages très-assurez* to which he appeals Grimarest is in error in saying that Madeleine Béjart was married to M. de Modène. This does not incline one to give any weight to his assertion that Molière's wife was Madeleine's daughter[2].

Bazin has demonstrated the untruth of the story of the Prince de Conti offering to make Molière his secretary[3]. That of the old gentleman in the *parterre* who cried out at one of the performances of *Les Précieuses ridicules* 'Courage, courage, Molière, voilà la bonne Comédie,' though often quoted, lacks confirmation, and is on the face of it improbable[4]. It is followed, however, by a piece of sound criticism. In answer to some critics who complained that *Les Précieuses ridicules* was a caricature, Grimarest replies: 'Mais Molière connoissoit déjà le point de vue du Théâtre, qui demande de gros traits pour affecter le Public; et ce principe lui a toujours réussi dans tous les caractères qu'il a voulu peindre.' On the other hand, his account of Molière's reasons for attacking the Medical Faculty is in the highest degree absurd. It all arose, he says, from a quarrel which Molière had with the wife of a physician with whom he lodged. In his irritation he wrote *L'Amour Médecin* which, adds our author, 'ne relevait pas à la vérite le mérite de son auteur.'

This examination should convince us that no reliance can be placed on Grimarest for the greater part of Molière's life, that is to say for the years before Baron comes on the scene. It is different with the last three years of Molière's life, after Baron had rejoined his company. For the greater part of the stories which relate to this period Baron is evidently the source. First we have a group of stories, of which the scene is laid in Auteuil, where Molière rented an *appartement* from 1666 to his death. The most improbable of these, but the best authenticated, for it is also related by Louis Racine, is that of the famous supper, to which Chapelle, who had a bedroom in the same house as Molière, brought Boileau, Lulli, Jonsac, and Nantouillet[1]. Molière, who was on a milk diet, drank his glass of milk and retired to bed, leaving Chapelle to do the honours. The friends drank hard, with the effect that they began to moralise and to take so gloomy a view of life that they determined to end it by drowning themselves in the river. They were prevented from carrying out this noble design by some servants and countrymen, and a quarrel ensued, which might have had disastrous results, had not Molière, warned by Baron, come upon the scene, and persuaded his friends to postpone their project till the next morning[2]. Another story, which also comes from Baron, relates to Chapelle and his valet, and like the former is a testimony to Molière's good sense and readiness of resource. Then we are told how Molière, being left alone with Baron, profited by the occasion to comment on Chapelle's drunken habits by way of warning to his young friend[3].

---

[1] It appears from documentary evidence that Jean Poquelin was in Paris on February 25 and July 3, 1642. The *tapissiers du roi* were on duty, two at a time, for three months in the year.

[2] *Vie*, p. 11 and pp. 35—37.

[3] *Vie*, pp. 13—14; Bazin, pp. 48—49.

[4] *Vie*, p. 20.

Auteuil is the scene of two more stories in which Baron plays a part. One relates to François Bernier and his visit to Molière on his return from the East[4]. The other is an amusing story about Molière, Chapelle and a lay-friar, whom they found in the boat on their return from Auteuil to Paris, and whom they appointed arbiter in a violent dispute as to the merits of Descartes and Gassendi as philosophers. It is in this story that Molière is reported to have said with regard to Gassendi's championship of Epicurus, 'Passe pour sa morale; mais le reste ne vaut pas la peine que l'on y fasse attention[5],' and on the strength of *Passe pour sa morale* Molière has been set down as a hedonist in morals. Grimarest, it may be remarked, rather discredits this story by saying at the end of it that Baron, who was present, was of an age *à négliger une pareille conversation.*

---

[1] Grimarest does not mention Boileau. For Louis Racine's account see Racine, *Œuvres*, ed. P. Mesnard, I, 261—262. According to L. Racine Boileau often related 'cette folie de sa *jeunesse*,' but in 1670, the earliest date at which Baron could have been present, he was thirty-four.

[2] *Vie*, pp. 82—89. In the *Réponse* (pp. 219—220) Grimarest says that the truth of this incident was confirmed by old people who had witnessed it.

[3] *Ib.* pp. 89—93.

[4] *Ib.* pp. 114—116.

[5] *Ib.* pp. 116—120.

In another Auteuil story Baron plays no part. It relates how Molière unburdened himself on the subject of his domestic troubles to his friends Jacques Rohault, the distinguished physicist, and François Mignard, the equally distinguished painter[1]. It has been suggested that this is another version, invented by Grimarest, of the similar story told in that scandalous libel *La fameuse comédienne*, in which Chapelle takes the place of Rohault and Mignard. There is however this important difference between the two versions that in Grimarest's Molière speaks of his wife as a coquette but as innocent, while in that of the anonymous libeller she is represented as actually unfaithful.

The story of the lay-friar is followed by three stories which are not connected either with Auteuil or with Baron[2]. In the first Chapelle reproaches Molière with his love of farce; the second reports a dull, pointless and improbable conversation between Molière and a certain courtier, and the third one between Molière and a young man who wanted to be an actor, Chapelle being present. The next two stories relate to Chapelle but not to Molière[3]. What is Grimarest's source for these five stories? Possibly Racine.

The stories are followed by an account of certain traits of Molière's character[4]. We are told that he was very methodical in his domestic arrangements; that a window opened or shut at the wrong time roused him to fury; and that a misplaced book was enough to prevent him working for a fortnight. This illustrates, with doubtless some exaggeration, what we know from other sources, that Molière was of a highly irritable disposition. Grimarest adds that he was very generous, and gave very liberally to the poor; that he was not a gambler, but that 'il avoit assez de penchant pour le sexe,' and then follows a story about his relations with the actress Mme de Brie.

His sensitiveness to faults of declamation in the interpretation of the plays[5], and the high standard which he exacted from the actors[6], are confirmed by *L'Impromptu de Versailles.* The account of his own acting agrees with that given by Mme Poisson[7], and may therefore be accepted with confidence. We are told that when he first went on the stage he spoke so fast as to make his acting unpleasant. In his efforts to control this, he contracted a sort of hiccup or spasm of the throat, which he never entirely lost, but which he concealed with great art.

---

[1] *Ib.* pp. 79—81.

[2] *Ib.* pp. 120—130.

[3] *Ib.* pp. 130—134.

[4] *Ib.* pp. 134—141.

[5] *Ib.* pp. 109—110.

[6] Elles [ses pièces] étoient representées avec un jeu si délicat que quand elles auroient été médiocres elles auroient passés. (*Ib.* p. 111.)

[7] *Mercure de France*, May, 1740. A daughter of the actor Du Croisy, she joined Molière's company just before his death, but she had previously acted at the Palais-Royal in *Psyché*.

'He used every action and gesture that were needed to move the spectator. He did not declaim at hazard, but he paid attention to every detail.' That Molière made free use of facial expression and bodily gesture, in which he resembled Garrick, will be readily believed by anyone who has read his plays with any care, especially some of the scenes of *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme* and *Le Malade imaginaire*, in which the action plays a more important part than the dialogue. The influence of the Italian *commedia dell' arte* would have been wholly in this direction. Grimarest is also quite worthy of credence when he contrasts the natural style of acting favoured by Molière with the bombastic and declamatory methods of the Hôtel de Bourgogne, for this again is confirmed by *L'Impromptu de Versailles*, in which Molière burlesques the acting of Beauchâteau and Mondory and the other actors of the rival theatre[1].

On the other hand the statement that 'no man worked with greater difficulty[2]' is in flat contradiction with the rapidity with which some of his comedies were written. What is seemingly true is that he spent a considerable time over the gestation of his greatest plays, before actually writing them.

There remains the account of his death and funeral[3]. That of his death must certainly have come from Baron, who after the fatal seizure accompanied him to his house and was with him till just before the end. Grimarest gives his age at his death as fifty-three, La Grange and Vinot as fifty-two or fifty-three. In reality he was fifty-one. Grimarest's account of the funeral is brief, and what he says about the mob which collected before the door of Molière's house does not agree with the testimony of an eye-witness, who writes, 'Il y avait grande foule du peuple, et on a fait distribution de mil à douze cent livres aux pauvres qui s'y sont trouvés à chacun 5 sols[4].' According to Grimarest it was fear of the crowd which led Mme Molière to throw them money out of the window, while according to the eye-witness a charitable distribution was made after the ceremony to the poor who had followed the procession. Grimarest ends his account of the funeral with a delightful little anecdote. A spectator having asked a woman whose funeral it was, she replied, 'Et c'est ce Molière,' whereupon another woman, who was looking out of her window, called out, 'Comment malheureuse! il est bien Monsieur pour toi.'

---

[1] *Ib.* p. 30.

[2] *Ib.* p. 26.

[3] *Ib.* pp. 153—161.

[4] See J. Loiseleur, *Les points obscurs de la vie de Molière*, 1877, pp. 350—351.

The most favourable view of Grimarest's merits is that taken by Gustave Larroumet in *La Comédie de Molière.* After protesting against what he considers Bazin's injustice he says, 'Grimarest écrit mal, il a l'esprit cancanier, il manque de critique, mais il fait son possible pour être bien informé, et somme toute, son livre a rendu les plus grandes services; c'est encore le plus riche fonds de renseignements sur l'histoire de Molière.... Grimarest n'a pas cessé d'être la source principale.' Let us see how far this view is justified, now that we are in a position to form a reasoned estimate. Grimarest's chief source was Baron, who for the last three years of Molière's life was closely associated with him. The stories, therefore, and the information generally which belong to this short period come from a well-informed and first-hand source. Against this we must set the fact that Baron was not only a vain egotist and therefore disposed to give undue importance to any incident in Molière's life in which he played a part, however modest, but that he was apt to let his imagination run away with him. Grimarest, on his side, was uncritical and ready to accept all that Baron told him; he was, moreover, careless and inaccurate and therefore liable to repeat incorrectly the information that he received. His account of *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme,* which must have come from Baron, is a good example of how between them they contrived to produce a story which can have had little or no foundation in fact.

Grimarest quotes Racine as a source of much information, but Racine's intimacy with Molière only lasted for at most two years and a half, and on Grimarest's own showing it was never of a close nature. Moreover, Grimarest has made such a muddle both of Racine's withdrawal of his tragedy from Molière's theatre and of his first introduction to Molière that it is difficult to believe that Grimarest can have had much intercourse with him. At most he may have told Grimarest one or two stories about Molière which he had heard from either Boileau or Chapelle.

As for Molière's family, this source seems to consist chiefly of a single informant, Madeleine Poquelin. But she was only six at the time of her father's death, and Grimarest seems to have carefully avoided consulting her on the one or two points on which she was competent to give information. On the whole then his claim that 'he had followed Molière with care from his birth to his death, without departing from the truth' is very far from being sustained. We may readily concede to M. Larroumet that 'he has never lied consciously and of set purpose,' and that 'more often than not an element of truth is mingled with his errors,' but if the net result is that 'we must closely examine everything that he relates,' to use M. Larroumet's own words, this hardly makes him a valuable authority.

But though for by far the greater part of Molière's life we can place no reliance on Grimarest, and though even for the last three years we can only accept his information as to facts with considerable reserve, his book may have a real value as throwing light on Molière's character. That is, in fact, chiefly what Grimarest claims for it. Some of the stories, he points out, show the esteem in which Molière was held both by the Court and the common people; another testifies to his liberality and kindness of heart, another to his presence of mind and common sense; this story exhibits his firmness, that his sincerity. The claim is plausible but is it justified?

Of the four Auteuil stories which come from Baron that of the supper-party is confirmed by Louis Racine, while we may accept the other three as substantially true. The stories of the supper-party and of Chapelle and his valet indicate Molière's common sense and presence of mind. We learn from that of the lay-friar that he was a partisan of Descartes as against Gassendi. But in the fourth story, that of Bernier's visit, it is Baron and not Molière who plays the principal part. There are four stories in the latter part of the *Life* in which no mention is made of Baron. Out of these, three are of little interest, while that of Molière's outburst to Rohault and Mignard is possibly only another version, arranged by Grimarest, of the similar story in *La fameuse comédienne.* Thus the net result of these stories as throwing light on Molière's character is very small. Of greater value and interest are the traits of character, the irritability, and the striving after artistic perfection, for, confirmed as they are by other information and especially by that charming little comedy, *L'Impromptu de Versailles,* they may be accepted with confidence. But it cannot be said that they throw any fresh light on Molière's character. There remains the account of the 'last act,' and for this we may be really grateful. Baron has perhaps emphasised his own part, but we may accept as substantially true the touching story of how he and Mme Molière tried to dissuade Molière from going to the theatre, and how he said to them, 'Comment voulez-vous que je fasse, il y a cinquante pauvres ouvriers, qui n'ont que leur journée pour vivre; que feront-ils si l'on ne joue pas? Je me reprocherais d'avoir négligé de leur donner du pain un seul jour, le pouvant faire absolument.' And then the last performance, the sudden seizure, and the end. It is this story of Molière's death on the field of battle that is Grimarest's chief contribution to his life.

ARTHUR TILLEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

LOPE DE VEGA'S COMEDIAS 'LOS PLEITOS DE INGALATERRA' AND 'LA CORONA DE HUNGRÍA.'

AT some time prior to 1603 (for the play is mentioned in the first edition of *El Peregrino en su Patria*), Lope de Vega wrote a comedia entitled *Los Pleitos de Ingalaterra.* It was not published till 1638—three years after the dramatist's death—in Parte xxiii of his *Comedias,* the privilege to print having been granted to the poet's son-in-law, Luis de Usátegui, on January 16 of that year. The dedication of the volume was written by Manuel de Faria y Sousa, who, in all probability, wrote the eulogistic 'Prologo,' which begins as follows: 'Este Tomo es la verdadera Parte xxiii de las Comedias del Padre dellas: del Alpha y Omega (permitasenos agora hablar con estas vozes) desta suerte de Poesia; pues al fin al fin Lope de Vega fue el principio y el remate della, de quien se debe decir lo que Veleo Paterculo dixo de Homero: que antes de si no halló á quien emitar, y despues no huuo quien enteramente le imitasse. Porque si bien algunos escribieron comedias con varios aciertos, las de Lope son de la Naturaliza, y las otras de la industria,' etc.

Perhaps we can ascertain more approximately the date of *Los Pleitos de Ingalaterra.* It contains no *figura del donayre,* first introduced by Lope in his comedia *La Francesilla,* and this play, its author tells us, was written before 1602 (the date of the birth of Montalvan). But there is other evidence as to the date of our play, though, perhaps, not so decisive. From a reference in Act I to the war in Piedmont, it must have been written after 1595, and an allusion in Act II points to the year 1598 or shortly after. Moreover Lope introduces, among the characters of the play, two rustics, Belardo and Riselo; Belardo being the name under which the poet often appears in his early plays; while Riselo is the pseudonym of Lope's intimate friend, the poet Pedro Liñan.

On December 23, 1633, less than two years before his death, Lope de Vega finished in Madrid the manuscript of his comedia *La Corona de Hungría,* the autograph of which, according to Duran, was formerly in the archives of the Marquis of Astorga. Duran possessed a copy of this autograph, and from this copy, at present in the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid, Sr. Cotarelo, on behalf of the Spanish Academy, has published the play in volume II of the new edition of Lope's dramatic works.

An examination of these two *comedias* shows that the plots are essentially identical, and that in *La Corona de Hungría* Lope has utilized entire passages of *Los Pleitos de Ingalaterra,* many lines having been transferred from the earlier play.

In December, 1633, the date of *La Corona de Hungría,* Lope was in his seventy-second year, and for some reason unknown he found it convenient to take an old play of his own and alter it to his purpose. We may presume that he had come into possession of the manuscript of *Los Pleitos de Ingalaterra,* after it had disappeared for many years from the eyes of the theatrical managers, and had passed out of the memory of playgoers, and that he resolved to utilize it. There is, in fact, only one *comedia,—Las Bizarrias de Belisa,—*of which we are sure that it was written after *Los Pleitos,* and, fortunately, the autograph of *Las Bizarrias de Belisa* is still extant, dated May 24, 1634.

A comparison of *Los Pleitos de Ingalaterra* with *La Corona de Hungría* is illuminating. It shows how the great poet, with more than a third of a century of experience behind him, remodelled an early play with such consummate skill as to transform it into a *comedia* so different from the original that the metamorphosis has escaped detection for nearly three centuries.

In *Los Pleitos de Ingalaterra* we find a King of England jealous of the attentions paid by the Conde de Bura to Queen Leonora. The King is on the point of leaving to command his armies in war, when the Queen, who is in advanced pregnancy, suggests that the Conde de Bura should go in his stead. This confirms the King's suspicions. In an interview the Conde de Bura tells the Queen that the King is in love with one of her ladies-in-waiting, and seeks to prove it by reading her a letter written by the King to the lady. Approaching the Queen to read the letter, the Count tries to embrace her, and we read this stage-direction: '*Quiere abraçarla y trauese la lechuguilla de la Reina á las puntas de un cuello que tendrá el Conde.*' At this moment the King enters.

In like manner *La Corona de Hungría* opens with the King of Hungary jealous of his Queen Leonora, on account of the attentions of Count Arnaldo. Liseno (like Florisandro in *Los Pleitos*) tries to convince the King that his jealousy is groundless. The King decides to lead his troops against the King of Poland. The Queen, who is pregnant, objects to this, and on the King's asking her who shall command in his stead, she proposes the Count Arnaldo, thinking thus to rid herself of the latter's importunities. The King says:

Por estar vos en los dias
del parto, no me he partido
a castigar prendas mias. (*La Corona*, p. 29, col. 1.)

The identical words are found in *Los Pleitos* (fol. 207, col. 2, ed. Madrid, 1638). The Queen says:

Si estáis tratando, señor,
de la partida a la guerra,
no me encubráis su rigor,
que, si amor mi pecho encierra,
también encierra valor.
Hablad delante de mí;
sepa yo si he de perderos.
Rey. ¿Oyes esto? (*Aparte.*)
Liseno. Señor, sí.
Leonor. Si tan presto no he de veros,
merezca veros aqui.
Rey. ¿Ves, Liseno, como aguarda
mi partida y la desea?
Ya le parece que tarda. (*La Corona*, p. 29, col. 2.)

The same words are found in *Los Pleitos* (fol. 208, col. 2), except line 4, which reads:

q̃ aunq̃ amor mi pecho encierra,

and Leonor says:

q̃ quiero este espacio veros,
y hablarle con vos aqui.

In the next line Liseno is changed to Florisandro.

Liseno, in attempting to dispel the King's suspicions, says:

Liseno. (El cielo ofendes, señor,
teniendo de un angel celos.
¡Mira que te hacen creer
con equívocos sentidos
cosas que no pueden ser!)
Rey. (No sujetes tus oídos
a palabras de mujer,
ni los rindas de esa suerte,
mira que las puertas son
por donde con lazo fuerte
entra al alma la traición
y a nuestra vida la muerte.
Ella muere ya de deseo
de verme ya de partida.
Liseno. (¿Eso dices?)
Rey. (Esto creo.)
Leonor. Durará mi corta vida
el breve tiempo que ós veo.
(¡Tal desamor! ¡Tal desdén!)

Liseno. (Perdóname, que es locura,
señor, tu rigor.)
Rey. ¿A quién
no detendrá tu hermosura,
mi Leonor, mi luz, mi bien?
Ya, por no daros enojos,
digo que vaya, mis ojos,
otro general por mí.
Leonor. Ya de dos almas ansí
cumplido habéis los antojos.
Ya no seréis su homicida
de alguna a quien distes vida.
Rey. ¿Quién os parece, señora,
que vaya por mí, si agora
dejo por vos la partida?
.... (*La Corona*, p. 30, col. 1.)

In *Los Pleitos* (fol. 208, col. 2) we read:

Florisandro. Zelos no ay cosa tan fea,
son pena de amor bastarda.
Mira, que te hazen creer
con equivocos sentidos
cosas, que no pueden ser.
Rey. No sugetes los oídos
á palabras de muger.
No los rindas dessa suerte;
que siempre las puertas son
por donde con lazo fuerte
entra el alma á la traicion,
y á nuestra vida la muerte.
Ella muere de deseo
de verme ya de partida.
Florisandro. Que dizes?
Rey. Esto, q̃ creo.
Florisandro. De una santa?
Rey. Es mi homicida,
muero, mi deshonra veo.
O estoy loco, ó quiere bien
al Conde.
Florisandro. Estraña locura!
Reina. Mi bien, no me hablais?
Rey. A quien
no detendrá essa hermosura?
quien podrá hazerla desden?
Digo, Leonor de mis ojos,
que por no daros enojos,
haré un General por mi.
Reina. Esto están pidiendo aqui
dos almas llenas de antojos.
No os dolais de la nacida;
duelaos la que no nació.
Rey. Pues quiẽ, Leonor de mi vida
irá en mi lugar? que yo
dexo por vos la partida....

The Queen suggests that the Conde de Bura, instead of the King, should command the troops. So, in *La Corona de Hungría*, as already observed, the Queen names the Count Arnaldo, and praises his soldierly qualities.

Rey. Porque es la alabança
la primer hija de amor.
Si al Conde no le tuuiera,
no le antepusiera á todos.
Florisandro. Antes, si bien le quisiera,
estoruara de mil modos
al Conde que no se fuera. (*Los Pleitos*, fol. 208, v. col. 1.)

In *La Corona* these lines are identical, except the last, which reads:

que el Conde a la guerra fuera. (p. 30, col. 2.)

The Queen rejoices that, at last, she is rid of the Count, saying:

Reina. Tu piedad, cielo, bendigo,
pues ya sin el Conde estoy,
fiero y mortal enemigo.
Porque dudo que en el suelo
naciesse tan atreuido
Cauallero, contra el zelo
á la Magestad deuido.... (*Los Pleitos*, fol. 208, v., col. 2.)

The same lines occur in *La Corona* (p. 30, col. 2), but here the two plays differ considerably, a whole scene being inserted in *La Corona*. In the latter play Lope has re-written the scene between the Queen and the Count, but the episode of the reading of the letter and the entanglement of the Count's collar, in one case, and his sleeve, in the other, is found in both plays, with slight modifications. It is better managed in *Los Pleitos*. We have already given (p. 456) the stage-direction of this play, which is followed by this dialogue:

Conde. Gente viene.
Reina. La arandela
á las puntas se ha trauado
de tu cuello.
Conde. Quitarela.
Reina. No puedes?
Conde. Estoy turbado:
heme abrasado en la vela.
Salen el Rey y Florisandro.
Reina. Rasga el cuello.
Conde. Ya lo intento.
Rey. Que es esto que ven mis ojos?
....
Conde. ....
y vine a ofrecer mi espada.... (fol. 210, col. 1.)

In *La Corona* the Queen attempts to snatch the letter from Count Arnaldo:

Arnaldo. El puño se me ha trabado
a las puntas o arandela
de tu cuello.

Leonor. Quita o tira.
Arnaldo. No puedo más.
Leonor. El Rey entra.

Salen el Rey y Liseno.

Rey. Conde, ¿de esta suerte aqui?
Arnaldo. Vine a ofreceros mi espada
en sabiendo la jornada,
y hablandola a la Reina, vi
una araña que el rubí
de sus mejillas subía,
y a los ojos se atrevía.
Llegué turbado al cabello,
asióseme el puño al cuello
y desasirle quería.
....
Rey. La Reyna se ha desmayado;
....
susto de la araña ha sido.
¡Señora! (p. 33, col. 1.)

In like manner in *Los Pleitos* we find the stage-direction:

Desmayase la Reina, and then:

Florisandro. La Reyna se ha desmayado
y el parto se anticipó
con el sobresalto. (fol. 210, v., col. 1.)

In both plays the Queen gives birth to two sons:

Florisandro. ...y vio que del tierno niño
solo se mostraba un braço,
....
..............................Lucena
truxo una cinta de un santo,
que atada al braço del niño
escondió al momento el braço. (*Los Pleitos*, fol. 213, col. 1.)

In *La Corona* we read:

Liseno. Sacó un infante la mano
en quien, una cinta atada,
reliquia de un santo obispo,
la volvió a esconder. (p. 34, col. 1.)

In both plays the King declares that the children are the sons of the Count, in each case the lives of the children are saved by Florisandro—Liseno; and a woman's corpse is substituted for the Queen:

Lisena. La Reina ha buelto del cruel desmayo:
yo tengo de sacarla de Palacio,
y darte en su lugar un cuerpo muerto,
quitando la vida á alguna esclaua,
que poco importa que una Turca muera.
Amortajala, y ponla en el estrado,... (*Los Pleitos*, fol. 214.)

In *La Corona* the lines read:

Liseno. Di que es muerta, y pues la noche
piadosa a ayudarnos baja,
como pudiere al jardín,
aunque sea en brazos, la saca,
que, para fingir su muerte,
hoy se me ha muerto una esclava,
y la pondré en su lugar
si tú tambien la amortajas. (p. 34, col. 2.)

Twenty years elapse between the first and second Acts, and in each play the second Act opens with the two sons and their tutor; in *Los Pleitos* the direction is:

Salen Vencislao, Enrique y el Ayo.

In *La Corona* it is:

Enrique y Alberto, hermanos, y Fabricio, su ayo.

In each case the brothers are disgusted with the study of Vergil, Cicero, Homer and Aristotle, while their spirits are stirred by the rattle of drums. While Lope has entirely re-written the first scene in *La Corona*, many lines of the old play remain.

Enrique. Yo estudio de mala gana:
y Virgilio y Ciceron
por preciarme de leon
me han seruido de quartana. (*Los Pleitos*, fol. 216.)

These lines thus survive in *La Corona*:

Enrique. Tampoco quiero saber
preceptos para poesía,
ni de Aristoteles quiero
saber su arte...........
....
Alberto. Quierenos dar por cuartanas
los estudios que aprendemos
del ánimo de leones.... (p. 37.)

The following passage occurs in the early play:

Que aborrezco quanto puedo
el abito y el Latin:
y si callo, es porque en fin
tengo á Florisandro miedo;
que á vezes nos da á entender
que no es tu padre ni mio,
y entre el amor y el desvio
mezcla el pesar y el placer.
Veinte años ha que no cessa
la guerra en Ingalaterra
....
Allí suena el atambor;
y aca estotro Licenciado
ciene de libros cargado
nuestro juuenil furor.

Declaranos de Virgilio obscuro
mientras el de Irlanda el muro
rompe al lugar en que viuo. (*Los Pleitos*, fol. 216.)

This is repeated in *La Corona*, with very slight changes:

Yo aborrezco cuanto puedo
el hábito y el latín,
y si he callado es, en fin,
más respeto que no miedo
A voces nos da a entender
que no es tu padre ni mío,
y entre el amor y el desvio
mezcla el pesar y el placer.
....
Veinte años ha que no cesa
entre Polonia y Hungría
la guerra, y ¡por vida mía!
que de las letras me pesa.
Allí suena el atambor
y acá estotro licenciado
tiene de libros cargado
nuestro juvenil furor.
Declaramos muy altivo
algún filósofo escuro,
mientras que Polonia el muro
rompe al lugar en que vivo. (p. 37.)

Compare also *Los Pleitos* (fol. 217, v., col. 1):

Ayo. Quiçá por este pecado
contra Leonor cometido
castiga el cielo ofendido
al Rey; perderá su estado,
y aun ruegue á Dios por la vida;

with *La Corona*, p. 39, col. 1:

Belisa. Que si por este pecado
contra Leonor cometido
castiga el cielo ofendido
al Rey; perderá su estado,
y aun podrá ser que la vida.

In *Los Pleitos* (fol. 217, v. col. 2) we read:

Ayo. Dexadle venga, y despues
ireis donde el cielo os guia.
Enrique. Pues donde está?
Ayo. En la montaña
en negocios de su hagienda.
Vencislao. Es donde está aquella prenda,
que todo el año acompaña?
Ayo. Allá está cierta muger
cuyo nombre es Florisea,
mas nadie sabe quien sea.
Enrique. Su amiga debe de ser.
Ayo. No es por Dios, que es virtuoso,
y ella es muger principal.
....
Vencislao. Patria, pues en ti naci,
lo que te debo te doy.

These lines are repeated, almost word for word, in *La Corona*, p. 39, col. 2.

Of especial interest is the comparison of the long passage in *Los Pleitos* (fol. 218), beginning:

> *Conde.* Alegres vozes suenan en Palacio,

with *La Corona* (p. 40, col. 1). It shows with what consummate skill and apparent ease the changes in the text were made.

It would lead us too far to note all the parallel passages; one significant example more must suffice. In *Los Pleitos*, fol. 219, v., we find the stage-direction:

Sale el Rey huyendo solo, and this monologue follows:

> *Rey.* Adonde avrá para mi
> remedio entre tanta guerra?
> pues no me sufre la tierra
> despues que al cielo ofendi.
> ……………………………………
>
> ……………………………………
> A traídor Conde de Bura,
> no bastaba que por ti
> dos Angeles que perdi
> cubre infame sepultura?
> Sino que dando fauor
> al de Irlanda, me has quitado
> agora todo mi estado,
> y antes de agora el honor.

Compare this with the following lines from *La Corona* (p. 43, col. 1).

> *Rey.* ¿Adónde habrá para mí
> remedio, amparo y consuelo,
> pues me le ha negado el suelo
> despues que al cielo ofendi?
> ……………………………………
> ¡Traidor Conde! ¿qué locura
> te mueve ya contra mí,
> si dos angeles por tí
> cubre infame sepultura?
> ¡Oh, qué venganza tan dura,
> perder por tu loco amor,
> no a Leonor, pues que Leonor
> fué por tu engaño traidora,
> sino mis reinos agora
> y antes de agora mi honor!

The defeated and fugitive King meets the Queen in a wooded region where he seeks shelter, and there follows the remarkable dialogue so much admired by Grillparzer (*Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Sauer, Vol. XVII, p. 184, Stuttgart, no date). Though considerably shortened in the later version, the very words of the old play are frequently retained. (Cf. *Los Pleitos*, fol. 220, col. 2, with *La Corona*, p. 43, col. 2, the passage beginning: Cuya es esta casa?) It is instructive to observe how the poet's wider experience has improved this scene. The passage following (*Los Pleitos*, fol. 221, v.) is adhered to very closely in *La Corona* (p. 45); and though many changes have been made, the rhymes of the earlier version have been preserved.

Act III opens in both plays with the entrance of soldiers in search of the King (cf. *Los Pleitos*, fol. 225, with *La Corona*, p. 50, col. 1); the last eight lines of the scene are identical. The stage-direction which follows in *Los Pleitos* reads: *Corren una cortina, y aparecen Vencislao y Enrique con una cortina* (*sic*) *asida entre los dos*, while in *La Corona* we find: *Abren las puertas y se ven debajo de un dosel Alberto y Enrique, asidos de una corona.* The rest of the scene in *Los Pleitos* is followed very closely in the later play, the first forty lines being identical in both plays.

The concluding scenes differ considerably in the two *comedias*, and it would be useless to point out resemblances. In both cases the brothers are victorious over their enemies and are to rule jointly. Dissatisfied with this arrangement, the decision as to which of the brothers is to be King is, in each case, left to the first person who, on the morrow, shall enter the city gates. This person happens to be the Queen, who is accompanied by the King, both being disguised as peasants. In both plays the brothers are married to the daughters of Florisandro—Liseno.

In spite of the identity of plot, and of the fact that numerous passages of the early play have been transferred verbatim to the later one, the marvellous dexterity with which Lope has handled the matter makes *La Corona de Hungría* read like an entirely different play from its precursor. The whole procedure illustrates once more Lope's lifelong indifference and carelessness with respect to his writings for the stage. He never took his plays nearly so seriously as he did his other poetical compositions.

In the present instance he did not even trouble to change the name of the Queen, who, in each case, is called Leonora. Still more remarkable is the fact that Lope did not hesitate to repeat the very striking incident of the spider, which he had used in the early play;—an incident so memorable that he might well think its repetition could not escape detection. An inventor of his limitless resources might have substituted any one of a dozen devices, but he simply did not care. The old one served the purpose of the hour, and beyond this Lope seems to have had no concern.

HUGO A. RENNERT.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., U.S.A.

WALTHER VON DER VOGELWEIDE: 'ABSCHIED VON DER WELT.'

(LACHMANN, 100, 24; PAUL, 91.)

> Frô Welt, ir solt dem wirte sagen
> daz ich im gar vergolten habe:
> Mîn grôziu gülte ist abe geslagen;
> daz er mich von dem brieve schabe, etc.

'EINE völlig ausgeführte dramatische Allegorie macht den Teufel zum Besitzer eines Wirtshauses, in dem die Welt als lockende Dirne ihr Wesen treibt. Walther hat lange dort gelebt; nun will er, da er seine Rechnung bezahlt hat, von dannen ziehen, nach Hause' (Burdach, *Walther von der Vogelweide*, 1900, p. 110). In different words, but otherwise in close agreement with this statement, commentaries[1] and monographs[2] on Walther have, ever since Simrock-Wackernagel, 1833, i, p. 213, described the outward situation of this poem, which, like the group of poems, Lachmann, 67, 8—32 and 122, 24—124, 1, must be attributed to the evening of Walther's life. This interpretation, looked at closely, is repulsive, as well as unjust to the poet. Would Walther, always so courteous in the best sense, have bestowed the epithet 'frouwe' on a 'lockende Dirne,' would or could he have made her say (100, 35): 'gedenke waz ich dir êren bôt,' and (101, 3) 'sô du mir rehte widersagest, so wirst dû niemer wol gemuot'? The misconception seems to have originated, in the first instance, in the word 'wirt' of the first line having been taken in the N. H. G. German sense of 'host,' 'innkeeper.' But M. H. G. 'wirt' means first of all: (*a*) Ehemann (cf. *Parzival*, 130, 20), (*b*) Haus-, Burg-, Landesherr, Gebieter (cf. *Parzival*, 119, 25: 'der hellewirt'; Walther, 28, 9), (*c*) Bewirter, Gastfreund ('hospes,' Walther, 29, 29; *Parzival*, 143, 18).

In the present passage I hold that 'wirt' has the significance of (*a*) and (*b*), i.e., the devil is the husband of 'frô Welt[1]' and is a great lord. The latter simile may well have been suggested by *Joh.* xii, 31: '(diabolus) princeps huius mundi'; for the first I cannot adduce, at present, any patristic evidence, but a slightly later proof comes from a poem (Hagen, *Minnesinger*, 3, 71b, no. 20) by Friderich von Sunburc, who flourished between 1247 and 1275. This is a riddle, the obvious solution to which is: 'frô Welt.' And in it l. 11 runs: 'der vrouwen namen, meister, rât, den tiubel hat sie z'ê genomen.' Moreover, as Friderich von Sunburc is to be classed among the conscious imitators of Walther (cf. Roesing, *Die Einwirkung Walthers von der Vogelweide*, Strassburg Diss., 1910, p. 109), it is most likely that the simile was deduced by him from these very lines of his master. After all, the step from 'diabolus est princeps huius mundi,' or better, from 'mundus est domus diaboli' (Guibert de Novigento, Migne, *Patrologia lat.*, tom. 156, col. 186) to the idea 'diabolus est maritus mundi' is not so very great or surprising. It is, at any rate, to be found again at a later period in Kirchhoff's *Wendunmut* (1602), ii, no. 125, where in a poem, *Was die Welt sey, eine kurze definition*, the world is called (l. 7 f.): 'desz Teuffels Lusthausz liebste Braut, Nach Adams Fall ihm selbst vertraut.'

---

[1] The new edition of Wilmanns, *Walther von der Vogelweide*, by H. Michel 1916, is not accessible on account of the war.

[2] M. Nussberger, *Walther von der Vogelweide, Essay und Übertragung*, 1913, still speaks (p. 31) of 'Walthers Dialog mit der Frau Welt, der schmeichelnden Aufwärterin in der Herberge des Teufels.'

But this does not exhaust the devil's rôle in the present poem. He is further conceived as usurer, as worse than a Jewish money-lender. This is, however, quite in keeping with his part as a great lord, for the great landed proprietors, both ecclesiastical and temporal, were the principal money-lenders in the early middle ages (cf. A. Schaub, *Der Kampf gegen den Zinswucher...im Mittelalter*, 1905, pp. 43 ff., 154 ff.). Besides, the metaphor is familiar in the church literature and may often have been used in sermons. Even as early as St Ambrose, *De Tobia liber unus* (Migne, t. 14, col. 770 f.) we read: 'Quis iste peccati est fenerator, nisi diabolus, a quo Eva mutuata peccatum obnoxiae successionis usuris defeneravit omne genus humanum? Denique quasi malus fenerator chirographum (cf. Lachmann, 100, 27, 'brieve') tenuit, quod postea Dominus suo cruore delevit[2].'

From all this evidence we may conclude that Walther's audience and that of a later date would not have found great difficulty in understanding the rôle which the poet has assigned to the devil in his poem.

---

[1] Since writing the above I have found that, as early as 1857, Dr Sachse expressed the same view in his programme *Über Konrads von Würzburg Gedicht der Welt Lohn*, p. 14, but even Wilmanns has apparently overlooked this, though he quotes Sachse (*Leben Walthers*, iii, p. 422) with reference to another point in the poem.

[2] A similar idea lies behind the following lines of a pseudo-Augustine *sermo* (Migne, tom. 42, 1117 f.): 'qui (*sc.* homo) ex paterno chirographo debitor inventus atque constrictus ab adversario (*sc.* diabolo) detinetur.'

The situation and thought behind this 'dramatic allegory' would thus appear to be as follows: Walther has often visited the court of the devil and his beauteous but deceitful wife 'frô Welt'; he has only too willingly partaken of the manifold pleasures[1] and honours offered there; and for these my lord asks a valuable pledge: the soul. But before it is too late, Walther has bethought himself of his true heritage, has renounced the pleasures and the service of 'frô Welt[2],' has turned his thoughts to the only true service, that of God[3]. Therewith he has paid his debt, redeemed his pledge. He goes to the court of his creditor to tell him this. Not finding him there, he leaves the message with his wife. In vain she tries to lure him back to the enjoyment of the dangerous pleasures of her court. The scales have fallen from his eyes, he now recognises her deceit ('lâge,' 101, 19), as well as the illusion of her beauty:

> do ich dich gesach reht under ougen,
> dô was dîn schowen wunderlich...al sunder lougen:
> doch was der schanden alse vil,
> dô ich dîn hinden wart gewar,
> daz ich dich iemer schelten wil (101, 9—13).

And so he bids farewell to her for ever: 'got gebe iu, frouwe, guote naht: ich wil ze herberge varn' (101, 21 f.), i.e., into the safe shelter of 'gotes minne[4].' The shadow of approaching death seems to hover over these lines as over 123, 9 ff., 31 ff.

Something might be said about the curious personification of 'Frô Welt' which lies behind the lines just quoted (101, 9—13). This realistic picture recurs again—and always in a clearer and more forcible form—in verse and prose, e.g., in the epic poem *Der werlte lôn* by Konrad von Würzburg and a prose version derived from it in Wackernagel's *Lesebuch*, i², p. 945; in a poem, perhaps contemporary with Konrad, by the Guotære, of whom nothing is known but his name, in Hagen's *Minnesinger*, iii, 41a, and Bartsch, *Deutsche Liederdichter*, 4th ed., pp. 341 f.; and in a verse in the long-winded dialogue between 'Minne' and 'Werlt' by Heinrich von Meissen (Frauenlob), who died in 1318 at

---

[1] Cf. also 123, 23: '...und mêrte ie dem tiufel sînen schal' and 60, 24: 'Wilt du (*sc.* Frô Welt) bezzer wünne, danne man dir günne froide und der gehelfen künne.'

[2] Cf. 67, 8.

[3] Cf. 67, 20: and also the heartfelt prayer 123, 3: 'mach ê mich reine, ê unreine mîn sêle versinke in daz verlorne tal'

[4] The same idea as in Walther's final lines appears in the following form in an early eighteenth-century poem on *Die Verachtung der Erden-Lust* by Juliane Magdalene Cyprianin, gebohrne Jägerin: 'Zu guter Nacht! ihr Lüste dieser Erden, Adjeu, ich sags euch noch ein mahl. Denn ich will nun ein Himmels-Bürger werden, Und gehe schon ins Freuden-Thal, Wo tausend Seraphinen wohnen, Hier giebt man mir vor Thränen Thronen, Hier wird das eitle Thun veracht. Zu guter Nacht! (*Sammlung auserlesener Gedichte*, Nordhausen, 1734, ii, p. 275.)

Mainz (ed. Ettmüller, 1843, p. 241); it is also found in a Persian poem by Ibn Jemin (14th century) to which Wackernagel (*Zs. f. deutsch. Altertum*, vi, p. 155) called attention (translated in J. von Hammer's *Geschichte der schönen Redekünste Persiens,* Vienna, 1815, pp. 236 f.). To these well-known instances I can add a slight allusion in a dramatic *Disputatio Mundi et Religionis,* in Latin, attributed, but without any substantial proof, to the French minorite Guide de la Marche of the end of the thirteenth century (published by B. Haureau, *Bibliothèque de l'école des Chartres*, 45, pp. 5—30). The lines are:

> Hunc (*sc.* mundum) cernunt exterius fatui mellitum
> Qui tum posterius trahit ad Cochytum[1].

But this may only be an expression of the same ascetic idea we find behind Walther, 124, 37[2]. There is a more distinct allusion in a Middle Frankish poem, *Das himmlische Gastmahl* (cf. P. Wüst, *Die Lilie...und andere geistliche Gedichte, D.T.d.M.*, xv (1909), p. 71): 'sie (*sc.* die wereld) suret hinden und sůzet for.' Again, the heading of a poem on the world by Michel Beheim (died c. 1475): 'ein peispel von einem weib, waz vorn schön und hinden scheuezlich' (MS. Palatin. 312 f. 185 r.; cf. H. Gille, *Die historischen und politischen Gedichte Michel Beheims, Palaestra*, 96, p. 145, note c), admits of no doubt. Finally, this symbolic representation of 'Frô Welt' is carved in stone on the south portal of the cathedral at Worms and on the outside of the north aisle of St Sebaldus Church in Nuremberg[3].

The question now arises: where was this picture of 'Frô Welt' derived from? Surely not, as has been suggested (cf. Sachse, *l.c.*, p. 15), from Walther's allusion, which in itself presupposes a familiar acquaintance with the idea on the poet's part as well as that of his audience. An allegorical picture of such distinctly ascetic colouring must rather have come direct from the *ecclesia militans*, from the church that in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries fought and thundered more energetically than ever against the serene, optimistic conception of the world set up by chivalry. This love of personifying abstract ideas on the part of the church found expression, especially at this period, in short, illustrative stories, *exempla*[1], and many of these found their way into sermons, or were invented for the use of the pulpit, and thus became familiar in wide circles. Might it not have been an *exemplum* that served as a source for these later descriptions of 'Frô Welt' and possibly for Walther too? There is in fact one which fulfils the necessary requirements. In its earliest form this *exemplum* has been handed down to us in two Latin versions, somewhat different in their setting, which I shall call A and B. A is to be found in fol. 25^r of the British Museum MS. Arundel 406, written, as far as this part is concerned, in or about 1273 by a German hand, most probably at Mainz. B is contained in the well-known compilation of the *Gesta Romanorum* which was originally perhaps composed in Germany in the early fourteenth century (cf. J. A. Herbert, *Catalogue of Romances in the British Museum*, iii (1910), p. 190); it was published by H. Oesterley, *Gesta Romanorum*, 1872, cap. 202; cf. also p. 743. There exists further a M.H.G. adaptation of B, somewhat diluted, in an Alsatian sermon written in 1362 (ed. by Birlinger, *Alemannia*, 2, p. 198), while in its Latin form the *exemplum*, occasionally, it is true, much altered in respect of its setting and tendency, occurs again and again in collections of similar stories, or of sermons interspersed with these stories[2].

---

[1] A second MS. of the poem has the variant in l. 2: 'Sed probant interius esse fellitum' and an unpublished M.H.G. adaptation of the *disputatio* in a Donaueschingen MS., No. 101 of the fifteenth century: 'Im angesicht schon und innen hol' agrees with this reading.

[2] diu Welt ist ûzen schœne, wîz grüen unde rôt,
und innân swarzer varwe, vinster sam der tôt.

[3] I purposely omit some other sculptural examples (at Basle, Freiburg i. B., Strassburg and Marburg), as they do not seem to me to express this idea.

---

[1] Cf. Th. F. Crane, *The Exempla of Jacques de Vitry*, 1890, pp. xvii ff. G. Franken, *Die Exempla des Jacob von Vitry*, vi, 1 of *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Mittellat. Philologie*, herausg. von P. Lehmann; A. Schönbach, *Studien zur Erzählungsliteratur des Mittelalters*, I, pp. 2 ff. (*W.S.B.*, vol. 139); J. Klapper, *Erzählungen des Mittelalters*, Breslau, 1914.

[2] We find the *exemplum* in two other MSS. of the British Museum, viz. fol. 56^v of Arundel 506, first half of the fourteenth century, from the monastery of St Michael near Mainz (M), and fol. 10^v of Add. 21147, middle of the fifteenth century, when it belonged to the Carthusians at Erfurt (E). Cf. J. A. Herbert, *Catalogue of Romances in the British Museum*, iii, pp. 558, 701. These are closely related to the A-form, so closely, indeed, that their texts may be used to emend the occasionally faulty readings of the latter. The MS. E attributes the vision to a 'dives nobilis in Austria,' otherwise merely a sentence is added here and there to A, as will be seen from the notes at the foot of the text. The E text was made use of in the *Promptuarium* (between 1435 and 1440) of the Dominican friar Joh. Herolt (cf. edition of 1518, sub lit. M, no. 68 and MS. Add. 19909 of the year 1473, fol. 213^r). The story is further to be found, embellished with additions in the knightly taste, but nevertheless clearly betraying its development from A, in the Breslau MS. I. F. 607 of the middle of the fifteenth century (cf. J. Klapper, *Erzählungen des Mittelalters*, 1914, no. 193). Some passages as well as the courtly style seem to suggest an influence of Konrad's *Welt Lohn*. In another Breslau MS., I. F. 115, of the fourteenth century, there is an abbreviated and very free adaptation of A which claims for its source an *epistola Alexandri* (printed by Klapper as no. 9). The *exemplum* occurs again in fratris Johannis Gobii *Scala Celi* (ca. 1350), edition Lübeck, 1476, fol. cxv sub 'Devicie'; here it is fundamentally changed, the vision occurring to a 'sanctus homo,' and the figure of 'vanitas mundi' is beautiful to behold from behind, but horrible in front ('videt eam sine oculis, ex omni parte anteriori vermes erumpere et fetorum fetidissimum exalare'). Two versions are contained in John Bromyard's (died 1418) *Summa praedicantium*, edition Venetiis, 1586, sub lit. M, cap. xiii, 2. The first shows a marked tendency: '...Et pro tanto congrue dicitur status mundi, sive Christianitatis, vel ecclesiae, cuidam fuisse ostensus in visione, in similitudine pulcherrime dominae, quam cum ipsam crederet esse matrem Dei se vertit et ostendit posteriorem eius partem esse turpissimam, dicens: "haec forma est ecclesiae Christianitatis vel mundi"'

Here are the two versions:

A

Fuit miles quidam et potens totus mundo deditus qui quadam nocte solus ante castrum suum [in] virgultum plenum deliciis ut melius de mundi pompa et eius gloria recogitare posset, descendit. unde cum iam dictis super cubitum suum innixus intenderet, quaedam domina super estimationem humanam formosa et habitu decentissime disposita et ornata[1] se ei presentavit dicens: ‘Ecce assum, quam tanto amore hactenus dilexisti, ad me accedas ut bene prospicias. Tali confortatus oraculo Dominam speciosissimam prospexit se beatum reputans quod respectum et affatum talis domine perfrui meruit. Cui illa[2]: ‘sicut inspexisti mea anteriora te rogo ut diligenter consideres mea posteriora.’ Quae cum ad eum convertisset, miles vidit eam plenam vermibus, putridine et inmundiciis et fetore ita quod horror istorum omnem gloriam prius visam superaret[3]. Ad quem illa: ‘Ego sum gloria mundi. tales sunt fructus mei.’ Ad haec verba ymago disparuit et miles emendatus rediit[4].

B

Quidam miles multum dilexit seculum et omnem intentionem ad hoc formavit ut mundo complaceret, unde amor mundi ipsum impedivit quod deum sequi non potuit. Quadam die venit ad eum quaedam sponsa dicens ei: ‘respice in me et vide pulchritudinem meam.’ Qui cum videret illam et multum delectaretur eam inspicere, miles dixit ad illam: ‘O domina, dic mihi que es?’ Respondit mulier: ‘Ego sum seculum quod tantum diligis et quod tibi videtur etiam pulchrum et dulce.’ Et dixit: ‘Respice me a tergo.’ Cum vidisset, apparuit turpissima, vermibus plena et fetens ut cadaver. Et dixit militi: ‘Sicud vidisti me sponsam decoram facie et a tergo despectam, sic erit tibi seculum horridum, fetidum et amarum quod te non deum sequi permittit.’ Hec miles cognoscens seculo renunciavit et bonis operibus in heremo deum sequi incepit et dies vite sue in dei servicio consumens.

I cannot enter here on a detailed examination of the interdependence

---

(cf. above A from ‘Quae cum ad eum convertisset,’ etc.). In the second there is the knight (‘miles’) of A B, but in the place of the Lady World we find a horse, splendid to all appearance, but its hind quarters are ‘clauda et putrida, et dictum fuit illi (militi) quod talis fuit mundus.’ Thus the *exemplum* had wandered to England where it assumed its characteristic form; the comparison of the world to a horse ridden by the devil is, however, to be found in the *De trinitate et operibus eius* (Migne, tom. 167, c. 645) of Rupert of Deutz (died 1135). Bromyard's *Summa* was known on the continent, and from his first version is derived, with stronger accentuation of its reformatory tendency, the *exemplum* in the Vienna MS. no. 1756 of the fifteenth century, fol. 4^b, printed by A. Schönbach, *Sitzungsberichte der Wien. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, 156, ii, p. 19, while the completely Protestant version in the *Sphinx* Heidfeldii (1604) (cf. Wilmanns, *Leben Walthers*, iii, p. 422) must be traced back to the Viennese version. Here the spectre says to the monk: ‘non sum virgo Maria sed sum mater Ecclesia videlicet Romana, quae in primo statu apostolis, martyribus, confessoribus et virginibus fuit pulcherrima et decenter ornata, nunc a posteriore, id est postremo tempore in papis et praelatis putrida sum et ignominiae plena.’ There is little doubt that the above is by no means an exhaustive list, but it proves the popularity of the story from the thirteenth century onward to the seventeenth. Its fundamental idea may have been influenced by a much older and in many respects similar *exemplum* of voluptuousness (‘lascivia’) in the *Vitae patrum* (Migne, tom. 73, c. 879) and again in the *Speculum ecclesiae* attributed to Honorius Augustodunensis (*Ibid.*, tom. 172, col. 1058), as well as by some old Patristic conceptions of the world (mundus = Niniveh = Jezabel), but the stimulus came undoubtedly from the practical demands of the ascetic party in the church, and this party opposed by every means in its power the serene conception of the world and the life of pleasure to which the nobility and not a few of the dignitaries of the church itself were addicted.

[1] *E* adds: in maxilla habens candorem lilij ruboremque rose.

[2] *M* adds: estne aliquid in me quid tibi displiceat? Respondit: nihil. Sed super omnium oculis es gratiosa. Cui illa: Sicut....

[3] *E* adds: atque in stuporem et admirationem ultra quod dici potest raptus est et confusus (similarly in the *Promptuarium*).

[4] *Prompt.* adds: et mundo renunciavit deo vivens.

of the later German versions of the *exemplum*. Suffice it to say that, thanks to the British Museum copy, we have proof of the story being extant just about the time that Konrad von Würzburg and the Guotære were composing their poems, and perhaps it is not a mere chance that A and M point to Mainz where Heinrich von Meissen lived for a time and died. The written source to which he refers:

> diu schrift sagt dinen rücke unvruot
> von natern, würmen ungedigen,

might thus have been nothing else than a copy of our *exemplum*. A cross-version of A and B would best serve as a source for Konrad von Würzburg and the same applies to the Guotære[1]. The former skilfully adorned the simple story with traits, partly of knightly and partly of spiritual colouring, and brought it into connection with the well-known figure of Wirnt von Gravenberg[2]. As for the masters who carved the allegory in stone, the one on the Rhine, the other in Bavaria, surely their ecclesiastical employers were more likely to have derived their knowledge of the subject from the widespread *exemplum* than, as has been suggested, from the poem of Konrad von Würzburg, the direct influence of which is restricted to the prose version in Wackernagel's *Lesebuch*, i², 945, to a not yet published M.H.G. poem on a similar subject in the Paris MS. Allemand 117, to two other codices in Berlin and Dresden and, possibly, the Latin *exemplum* in the Breslau MS., I. F. 607.

---

[1] Cf. for the Guotære Bartsch, *l.c.*

l. 6 and 11 f. Ern sach ouch schœner vrowen nie... Von golde ir krône wol geberlt ir wât, ir gürtel, ir vürspan.	(A) dominam super estimationem humanam formosa et habitu decentissime disposita et ornata.
l. 9. du hâst gedienet vlîzic mir gar dîne tage: nu bin ich komen...	(A) Ecce assum quam tanto amore hactenus dilexisti.
l. 13. dô sprach er: 'vrouwe, wer sît ir?'	(B) O domina, dic mihi, quae es.
l. 14 f. Sî sprach zuo zim: 'ich binz diu Werlt, du solt mich hinden schouwen an.'	(B) Ego sum seculum....'Respice me a tergo.'
l. 16. sich, disen lôn den bringe ich dir.	(A) tales sunt fructus mei.
ll. 17–19. Ir was der rucke vleisches hol, er was gar kroten, würme vol und stanc alsam ein vûler hunt.	(B) apparuit turpissima vermibus plena et fetens ut cadaver.

Finally, the introductory situation (ll. 1 f.): 'ein...ritter lac totsiech dâ an dem bette sîn' may well have had its starting point in A: '...super cubitum suum innixus.'

[2] The E version ('dives nobilis in Austria') and that in the Breslau MS. I. F. 607 point in the same direction. Cf. note 2 on p. 469. A similar case is that of Hartmann's *Armer Heinrich*.

In turning again to Walther, we find ourselves in a more difficult position, for we lack a direct proof that the *exemplum* was in existence when he composed his poem, say about 1225, and we find in it only a faint echo[1] of the central motive of the story. Further, even admitting a sufficiently early date for the *exemplum*—and apart from stylistic considerations, there are indications that the parent MS. of this part of the *exempla*-collection in A was of Cistercian origin and considerably earlier—it might be argued that this particular motive had already been detached from the story and become independent (cf. above p. 468, the heading of Beheim's poem); it might have been widely familiar through its use in the pulpit, for only in that case could Walther have expected his allusion to be understood. If this were so, therefore, the *exemplum* could only be said to have exercised an indirect influence on Walther's poem.

There is another point worth mentioning. We know now that the later M.H.G. poems on the world are in their treatment of the subject not indebted to Walther, even though their authors may have been acquainted with his poem. But what about the anonymous French poet who wrote a *Vers du monde* in seventeen stanzas[2]? In the twelfth and seventeenth stanzas of this poem occur the following lines (12, 1—6):

Mondes, hardiement me vant
Que cil qui te voient devant
Sanz toi par derriere esgarder
Ne se vont nient apercevant
Comment tu les vas décevant
Si qu'il ne s'en sèvent garder.

And 17, 1, 8—12:

Mondes, je praing á toi congié.
....
Or voi, quant connois mon domage,
Comment tu m'as le dé changié;
Or vueil issir de ton servage,
Et corre à mon droit héritage,
Que Diex m'a fet et esligié.

If we compare with these lines those from Walther quoted above p. 467 and Lachmann, 101, 19 f.: 'wan deich fürhte dîne lâge, vor der sich nieman kan bewarn,' we are struck by the similarity in thought and treatment; and this similarity is so great that it can hardly be explained by regarding the *exemplum* or the particular motive from it as a common source. Nor can Walther have been the borrower, for even granting, strange as it would be, that he picked out just these two motives—the revelation of the dread secret of the world and the leave-taking—from the seventeen stanzas abounding in invectives against the world, how could he have understood the extremely faint allusion in 12, 2—5 and have given it just sufficient colouring to let us recognise whence it comes without offending our aesthetic feeling? If then, the date of the *Vers du monde* is subsequent to Walther,—and Romance colleagues assure me on linguistic grounds there can be no doubt of this—a direct influence of his poem is at least a possibility, the more so as this allegory of the world and its personification as Dame World, is otherwise, as far as I am aware, foreign to Old French literature. In any case, the ground seems firmer here than it is for establishing a similar connection between Walther's *Palindrom*[1], 87, 1, and John Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, ll. 436 ff., as was recently suggested by S. Aschner, *Münchener Museum*, 2, p. 114.

---

[1] The introduction of the motive as it stands is in fact a flaw in the poem. One should expect that the revelation of the dread secret—in the *exemplum* the case is quite different—would cause Dame World not a little perturbation; but there is not a trace of this. Again, it is strange that Walther should answer her renewed solicitations to come back to her (101, 19) with the words: 'daz tet ich wunderlîchen gerne.'

[2] M. L. A. Jubinal, *Nouveau recueil de contes*, tome ii, p. 128, from MS. franç. 837 (formerly 7218) of the Bibl. Nationale, attributed to the end of the thirteenth century.

R. PRIEBSCH.

LONDON.

---

[1] I take the opportunity of noting that this poem was still familiar as late as the end of the fifteenth century, although it went under the name of Cato. Cf. 'Katho spricht: wer zů eren werdenn mag, dem ist ain wort als ein schlage,' etc. (Walther, 87, 3f.). This reference is to be found in *Gut nutzlich lere vn̄ vnderweysung in teutsch beschribē ausz den parabolen...Salomonis, Auch ausz Kathone, Julio vnd ausz and'n lerern vnd poeten*, printed by Johannes Baemler, Augsburg, 1472 (British Museum, I. B. 5647).

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

Some Difficulties of 'The Seafarer' reconsidered.

One outstanding difficulty of *The Seafarer* has always been the interpretation of the word *forþon* in ll. 27*a*, 33, 39, 58*a*, and possibly l. 64. In not one of these passages does the usual meaning 'therefore' or 'because' satisfy the sense, in spite of the ingenious attempts of some scholars to make it do so.

Of the earliest editors, Thorpe showed some idea of the problem presented by the word, for he translated it in ll. 27, 39 and 58*a* by the vague 'for,' though without comment.

Rieger, in the article in which he first put forward the theory that *The Seafarer* was a dialogue between an old and young sailor, divided the poem so that *forþon* four times began a speech of the young man, and avoiding the unsuitable 'therefore,' rendered the word by 'but':

> *Forþon* ist hier (l. 27) und 33, 39, 58, 72, aus der causalen in die adversative Bedeutung verschoben. (*Zachers Zeitschrift*, Bd 1.)

This suggestion was opposed by Kluge (*Englische Studien*, Bd 6), who regarded the adversative use of *forþon* as 'unjustifiable,' thus forcing the young sailor, to whom he gave ll. 33—66 as one long speech, to declare that his desire for the sea was inspired by the thought of its hardships.

This somewhat strained explanation was also given by Boer (*Zachers Zeitschrift*, Bd 25), who maintained that *forþon*, in ll. 33 and 58, was used in the ordinary sense, but that elsewhere it was a sign of interpolation. Since it appears paradoxically in l. 33 (where Boer believed that a separate poem began) and in l. 58, he assumed that the interpolator had deliberately taken advantage of a peculiarity of style to cover the insertion of irrelevant matter.

In the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, vol. XVII, W. W. Lawrence destructively criticised Boer's elaborate theory of addition and subtraction, and insisted that nothing could bridge over the break in sense if *forþon* was to keep the meaning 'therefore' or 'because.'

Moreover he partly solved the problem by bringing forward the fact that in Northumbria, where he assumed that *The Seafarer* was first composed, *forþon* could be used as a loose connective, equivalent to 'so.' He showed that many examples of this could be found in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* where the West Saxon versions usually had *witodlice* or *sōþlice,* or some word of the kind.

This loose connective, though preferable to 'therefore,' in that it does not insist on logical sequence of thought, still leaves the sense vague. Whether two men, or, as is generally agreed, one, uttered the thoughts expressed in the poem, the alternation of idea is the same, the dire troubles of the mariner's life, the ignorance of the landsman, *and yet* the irresistible attraction of the sea.

I wish therefore to defend Rieger's adversative rendering of *forþon* as adding to the colour and force of the poem. Each of the lines 27*a*, 33, 39, and 58, becomes natural and unstrained if *forþon* means 'and yet,' or 'but,' and I believe that Kluge's epithet 'unjustifiable' is not deserved.

Professor Napier, in a letter in 1916, said: 'The *forþon* in l. 33, and perhaps also in l. 27, may quite well mean "in spite of this, and yet."' (Only those two passages were under discussion at the time.)

Although I cannot claim to have searched Old English literature exhaustively, I have found what appears to be good evidence for the adversative use.

In the first place, to recall an obvious fact, the prefix *for* had, in all the Germanic dialects, a reversive as well as an intensive force, and that the preposition *for* also had the double significance is suggested by such phrases as the English 'for all that' and the similar Icelandic use of *fyrir* (cf. *Laxdaela Saga,* chap. 31, l. 21, 'þér er svefns, en þó mun fyrir hitt ganga.' 'Thou art dreaming, but in spite of that it will come to pass').

The double value of this preposition is not confined to Germanic, for the Italian *però* (Latin *per hoc*) is 'Teils conclusive teils adversative Partikel' (Diez, *Etym. Wörterbuch*).

The earliest example of *for* in this sense recorded in the *New English Dictionary* comes from the Saxon Chronicle under the year 1006:

> Ac for eallum þissum se here fērde swā he sylf wolde.

A similar passage occurs under the year 1011.

Much earlier, *for* appears in this way in *Genesis,* l. 2473 (cf. Grein, *Sprachschatz*):

> Onfōþ þǣm faemnum, lǣtaþ friþ agōn
> Gistas mīne, þā ic for Gode wille
> Gemundbyrdan, gif ic mōt, *for ēow.*

Kennedy's translation runs:

> Take now the maidens and leave my guests in peace, for I will defend them *against you*, before God, if so I may.

From such use of *for*, we should expect *forþon* (i.e. 'for þǣm') to mean 'in spite of it' as well as, if more rarely than, 'therefore,' and it seems to do so in the following passages.

1. In Wright's *Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies* there is a tenth century gloss:

> Dehinc i. deinde, abhinc rursum dein vel þonane vel *forþan.*

2. King Alfred used *forþon* to translate a distinct adversative in his version of Gregory's *Cura Pastoralis,* chapter 21. The original Latin reads:

> *Sed* inter haec sciendum est, quia dum ad increpationem se mens doctoris exasperat, difficile valde est, ut non aliquando et ad aliquid quod dicere non debet, erumpat.

King Alfred renders this passage:

> *Forþǣm* þonne þaes recceres mōd wyrþ tō rēþe on þǣre þrēaunga þonne abiersþ þǣr hwīlum hwaethwugu ūt þaes þe he sugian sceolde,

and Sweet's modern English translation has:

> But when the ruler's spirit is too severe......

The passage preceding this one emphasises the *forþǣm,* for the ruler is urged to show anger against the sins of his subjects for his own future safety, *but yet* not to be too violent.

3. The Blickling *Homile* for Palm Sunday furnishes another example:

> þā hē þā geseah þaet hīe nǣnige bōte dōn noldon, ah hīe *forþon* heora yfelum þurhwunedon....

which Morris translates, rightly as I think:

> But when he saw that they would not show any amendment or sorrow, but continued *nevertheless* in their sins....

Again, a little earlier in the same *homile,* Morris gives 'nevertheless' for *forþon,* apparently correctly, although in this case 'therefore' or 'for this reason' would not be quite so much out of place:

> Sēo ceaster þonne waes hēh ond aldorlic, ah *forþon* Crist þā mycclan burh ond þā hālgan Gerusalem swā forhogdlīce nemde, forþon þe þā burhware him wǣron for heora ungelēafan and māndǣdum swīþe forhogde ond ungecorene....
>
> Yet this city was high and princely, but *nevertheless* Christ so contemptuously mentioned the great city....

In the *homile* on Saint Martin *forþon* seems once more to stand for 'nevertheless,' but Morris renders it 'also even,' and this instance by itself would hardly be convincing evidence:

> Waes hē tō þaes ārfaest þaet him waes ǣghweþer on weorce ge þaet hē leng from Cristes onsȳne wǣre, þaet hē þone gesāwe. Hē þā *forþon* Drihtnes willan sōhte and þus cwaeþ, 'Min Drihten longe ic waes nū on heardum campe hēr on worlde, ac þonne hweþre ne wiþsace ic þon þaet ic on þǣm campe leng sīe, gif hit þīn willa swīþe biþ'......

Surely Saint Martin was weary of the world, *but yet* he sought the will of God, even if it meant longer toil.

4. The following passage is taken from the *Vercelli Homilies* (*Festschrift für Lorenz Morsbach*, p. 101):

> & lǣten wē ūs singallice bīon on gemyndum & on geþancum þaes egesfullīcan daeges tō cyme, on þām wē sculon Gode riht agifan for ealles ūres līfes dǣdum, þe wē sīþ oþþe ǣr gefremedon from fruman ūres līfes ende *forþan-þe* wē nū magon behȳdan & behelian ūra dǣda. Ac hīe bīoþ þonne opena & unwrigena.

Evil deeds must be accounted for in the future *in spite of* the fact that we conceal them in this life.

5. Several passages in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* look temptingly negative, but it is difficult to judge the exact value of *forþon* in these places, partly because of the looseness of its use throughout and partly on account of the lack of intelligence of glossators in general which makes it hard to tell whether the whole sentence has been understood or only a common meaning written above each word.

In the Gospel of St John, chapter ix, v. 41, it looks as if *forþon* were intended to be adversative as the alternative word is *hueþre*:

cuoeþ him se haelend gif blinde aron naefdo gie synne forþon ꝉ hueþre
dicit eis Iesus si caeci essetis non haberetis peccatum vero

cuoeþ forþon ꝉ þte ue gesego synn iuer wunaþ
dicitis quia vidimus peccatum vestrum manet.

It is, however, possible that the scribe only meant to record the two most usual senses of *vero*.

Perhaps it is dangerous to form a theory on such limited evidence as that given above, but since much of it comes from homilies it would seem probable that *forþon* was used in the adversative sense in everyday speech, although, at least in Wessex, not felt to be suitable for poetry. This would appear the more likely when the Germanic descent of *for* as an adversative is taken into consideration, for this use must have survived somewhere in England, before it became common in Middle English.

If this were so, then a poet of Mercia or Northumbria, where admittedly *forþon* was allowed greater freedom than elsewhere, might well have felt licensed to use it if he wished even with the meaning 'and yet.' That this was common in Northumbrian poetry cannot be maintained, for otherwise traces would have remained in the West Saxon versions which have come down to us, but an Anglian poet might have been able to make use of the phrase without being guilty of a glaring fault of style. This, I believe, is what the poet of *The Seafarer* has done. It is noteworthy that all the passages where the adversative rendering is most needed occur in the genuine *Seafarer* poem (i.e. before l. 64) and where the word appears afterwards the meaning 'therefore' is quite possible. *Forþon* would thus form a marked feature of style, particularly striking to a West Saxon, and, as Boer suggested, may have been turned to account by the man who tinkered with the original perfection of the work. Thus, in l. 64, where the Seafarer's longing for the sea is said to lead to his desire for the joys of the Lord, this seeming inconsistency may be due to a mistaken use of *forþon*, thrust in to bridge a gulf of idea by one who had not grasped its full value in the poem.

In any case, if the adversative use of *forþon* in *The Seafarer* be rejected, it is difficult to see how a clear sequence of thought can be traced and a maze of interpolation avoided.

In conclusion I should like to point out, though very tentatively, that the rather obscure passage, *Beowulf*, ll. 1057—9, becomes more understandable if *forþan* can be taken in the way that Rieger took it for *The Seafarer*.

Metod eallum wēold
gumena cynnes, swā hē nū gīt dēþ
forþan biþ andgit ǣghwǣr sēlest,
ferhþes fore-þanc.

Although God rules the race of men, *yet* intelligence and forethought are necessary. Might not this be a trace of the Anglian origin of *Beowulf*?

I hope in time to gather more evidence for the adversative use of *forþon*, but I trust that what is already given may be some small defence of a very desirable rendering.

Line 21: huilpa.

In line 21, the Seafarer took for his joy the cry of an obscure bird called the *huilpa* whose name does not occur again in Old English. Most editors have glossed the word as 'sea-bird,' avoiding any closer specification, while Hönncher for far-fetched reasons identifies it with the whale.

Skeat, in his *Etymological Dictionary*, under 'whaup,' remarks:

> Probably the same as huilpa (for hwilpa) in *Seafarer*, l. 21.

If only for phonetic reasons, this is more than probable, and is, I believe, generally accepted, for an Old English form of 'whaup,' if it existed, should be *hwealpa* or *hwalpa*, which would be in ablaut relationship to *huilpa*.

But further evidence to connect the *huilpa* with the whaup or curlew is forthcoming. The Greater Godwit is called in some parts of England and Ireland the *Yarwhelp* or *Yarwype*, and undoubtedly in the second part of the word we have the Old English *huilpa* still surviving. The word is quoted in Wright's *Dialect Dictionary*, and is given in some modern bird-books and in many of those of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Although the godwit is not a curlew, being a member of the snipe family, the older writers on birds frequently emphasise his likeness to the larger curlew.

Edwards in his *Gleanings from Natural History*, 1743, says of the American godwit, 'It is called by the English at Hudsons Bay a Curlew.'

I think it is clear that in *Yarwhelp* the *-whelp* means curlew (cf. Dutch *welp*, a curlew), but the exact meaning of *Yar-* is more doubtful. It would be most suitable if it implied a diminutive, as is rather suggested by Willoughby, *Ornithology*, 1678, who identifies the Yarwhelp with the 'barge' of Bellonius (Pierre Bellon), 'which,' he says, 'they in French call "Petit Corlieu."' Unfortunately no extant Old English word seems to support this explanation.

Another possible source might be the Middle English verb *yarren* or *garren* (cf. O.E. *georran*, *girran* or *gyrran*) used of jarring sounds and, very frequently, of the shrill cries of birds. Examples are given in the *New English Dictionary* under *garre*.

Or could *Yar-* represent a dialectal form of the O.E. *ear*, sea, with the initial sound derived from shifted accent, somewhat as the O.N. *jarl* developed? If so, it would refer to the haunt of the creature. In any case, whatever qualifying syllable is needed to contract a curlew into a godwit, assuredly the bird which the Seafarer saw and heard in chorus with the eagle, tern and mew, was the very one which he would be most likely to see round Northern coasts, the whaup.

MARJORIE DAUNT.

LONDON.

'WUNDER ANE' IN LAYAMON'S 'BRUT.'

The form 'ane' found frequently in the *Brut* in combination with 'wunder' and 'swiðe' would appear from his glossary to be regarded by Madden as the accusative singular of the indefinite article 'an.' This might suit passages like l. 10355 where the sentence containing it has a noun in the accusative singular for it to agree with. But in most passages where it occurs there is no such noun and we must evidently explain it as an adverb with intensive force, e.g. in 30302 'iwærð him abolȝe bitter ane swiðe' (he was swollen with anger very bitterly), 10577 'wunder ane wide' (wonderfully far), and ll. 24799, 25826, 26104, where we have 'wunder ane swiðe' and no noun in the accusative case. The adverbial form may be traced to the genitive plural of the numeral 'an,' as in 'anra gehwilc' (every one) and in the Old Norse where the genitive plural intensifies the superlative as in 'einna mestr' (greatest of all). Owing to levelling of inflexions and perhaps the influence of 'einna' the English genitive plural of 'an' sometimes appeared as 'ane,' e.g. 'our ane,' 'your ane' (of us alone, of you alone). In Middle English the intensive adverbial phrase takes the form of the doubly marked genitive plural 'of ane,' 'of one,' not only with superlatives as 'starkest man of ane' (*Bruce*, IV, 74), but also with positive adjectives as 'a fowll gyane of ane' (an especially foul giant) (*Bludy Serk*, 18) and as late as the sixteenth century 'ane fair castell of one' (Stewart, *Cron. Scot.*). The usage still survives in the common Scottish combination of the intensive adverb 'gey' with 'an' as 'gey an gude' sometimes spelled as one word 'geyan.' We also find it in the North of England, as in Tennyson's *Northern Farmer* 'straange an' cowd (wonderfully cold).' Some of the above quotations will be found in the *N. E. D.* s.v. 'one.'

MICHAEL MACMILLAN.

BIRMINGHAM.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF 'THE CURES OF THE DISEASED.'

In 1915 the Clarendon Press issued a reproduction in facsimile of the earliest pamphlet on tropical medicine, entitled *The Cures of the Diseased. In Forraine Attempts of the English Nation.* London, 1598, to which Mr C. Singer supplied an Introduction dealing with the authorship of the work. In the edition from which this reprint was made, the writer signs himself G. W. Mr Singer shows that this G. W. is to be identified with the George Wateson, mentioned by Hakluyt in 1600 (preface to Vol. III of the *Voyages*) as the author of such a pamphlet, and the identification is confirmed by the existence of another edition of the pamphlet in the British Museum, which is signed in full, George Wateson. Mr Singer goes on to suggest that George Wateson is George Whetstone, the poet and miscellaneous writer. He explains the difference in the form of the name as due to Hakluyt's knowing the writer by hearsay only. This theory seems to be untenable. Whetstone certainly varies the form of his name—he spells it Whetston, Whetstone, Whetstones, Whetstons, as Mr Singer indicates—but he never uses a form approaching Wateson.

In the course of his argument, Mr Singer says that the last known work of George Whetstone, his *Censure of a Loyall Subject*, was published in 1587, and states that no notice has been found of his death. It appears, however, from a note prefixed by the publisher, Thomas Cadman, to Whetstone's *Sir Phillip Sidney, his Honourable Life, His Valiant Death*, etc. (entered at Stationers' Hall, June 15th, 1587: reprinted in *Frondes Caducæ*, Vol. I, 1816), that Whetstone died, or was killed ('destinie and fate hath too untimely ended his days'), shortly before the publication of this work. He was certainly dead in 1600, when Hakluyt speaks of George Wateson as if still alive, since the writer of the Preface to *Belvedere, or the Garden of the Muses*, 1600, classes him with the 'deceased' authors from whom material has been drawn. It seems impossible, therefore, that he should have been the author of *The Cures of the Diseased*.

D. M. MEAD.

ENGLEFIELD GREEN.

FIELDING'S 'MISCELLANIES.'

I. *Dates of Publication.* The actual dates of publication of Fielding's *Miscellanies* of 1743 seem not yet to have been noted by critics. Lawrence (*Life*, p. 181) says the volumes appeared 'in the course of the year 1743'; Keightley (*Fraser's Magazine*, January 1858, p. 12), 'during the spring or summer of this year'; Miss Godden (*Henry Fielding*, p. 144), 'probably, in April.' Dobson (*Fielding*, 1905, p. 98) notes, 'By advertisement in the *London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, they would seem to have been published early in April, 1743.'

The *St James Evening Post*, Nos. 5179, 5180, 5181, March 22—24, 24—26, 26—29, 1743, advertises the First Edition: '*On Thursday the 7th of April, will be de-/ liver'd to the* SUBSCRIBERS, / MISCELLANIES. / In THREE VOLUMES, Octavo, / *By* HENRY FIELDING, *Esq*; ....'

The *General Evening Post*, 'From Tuesday, April 5, to Thursday, April 7, 1743,' advertises: 'This Day, April 7, began to be delivered to the / Subscribers, / Miscellanies. In Three Volumes. Octavo. / By Henry Fielding, Esq....' The same paper, 'From Thursday, April 7, to Saturday, April 9, 1743,' advertises: 'This day was published, / And ready to be delivered to the Subscribers, / Miscellanies....'

The Second Edition is listed in the *Gentleman's Magazine* of April 1743, page 208.

The *General Evening Post* 'From Thursday, April 21, to Saturday, April 23, 1743,' advertises: 'Next Week will be published, / Price bound 15s. / The Second Edition, of / Miscellanies. In Three Volumes, Octavo. / By Henry Fielding Esq....' The same paper for April 23 to 26 has the same advertisement with the first words altered to 'This Day were published....'

II. *List of Subscribers.* The maker of the Bibliography in Henley's edition of Fielding's *Works, Miscellaneous Writings* 3. lvii, says the Second Edition of the *Miscellanies* omits the list of subscribers. I have two copies of this Second Edition. One copy contains the list; the other omits it.

III. *Alterations in Poems.* In the Preface to the *Miscellanies* (1. iii), Fielding says his modernization of the Sixth Satire of Juvenal (1. 73 ff.) 'was originally sketched out before I was Twenty.' The lines (1. 91, ll. 1—4):

> But say you, if each private Family
> Doth not produce a perfect *Pamela*;
> Must ev'ry Female bear the Blame
> Of one low private Strumpet's Shame?

show that at this one point at least the piece was touched up after the appearance of Richardson's novel. In *Modern Language Review* VII, p. 97 and *Modern Language Notes* XXIX, p. 29 I have shown that the poems 'Of Good Nature' and 'While at the Helm of State you ride' were modified, perhaps especially for the *Miscellanies*.

JOHN EDWIN WELLS.

NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT, U.S.A.

LESSING, MAFFEI AND CALEPIO.

Lessing's discussion of Voltaire's *Mérope* and his comparison of that play with Maffei's on the same theme occupy Sections xxxvi to l of the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*. This, if we include the digressions on questions of dramatic theory, represents about one-seventh of the entire work. In the following note I deal with the sources of Lessing's knowledge of Maffei, a matter which has not yet been cleared up.

Lessing possessed two editions of the Italian play: that in the *Teatro del Sig. Marchese Scipione Maffei*, edited by G. C. Becelli, Verona, 1730, and an edition of *Merope* published at Livorno in 1763[1]. He was under the impression that the earlier of these contained the text of the original edition (Modena, 1714), and that the edition of 1763, from which he makes his quotations, corresponded with the 'nachherigen Ausgaben.' As a matter of fact, the reverse is the case: the edition of 1763 is a reprint of the first edition, while that of 1730 is really the second edition. This accounts for Lessing's error in Stück xliii (p. 365): 'In der ersten Ausgabe nennt Aegisth den Polydor seinen Vater; aber in den nachherigen Ausgaben ist von gar keinem Vater mehr die Rede.' The readings of the two editions are as follows:

ACT III, SC. IV, 1045 ff.

First Edition (Modena, 1714, and reprint, Livorno, 1763).	*Second Edition* (Venice 1730).
Egi. Ah Polidoro! Tu mel dicesti un dì, ch' io mi guardassi Dal por già mai nella Messenia il piede.	*Egi.* Fatal Messenia! Mel disse il padre mio, ch' io mi guardassi Dal por già mai nella Messenia il piede.
Mer. Polidoro! Chi sei? Creder bisogna Ai vecchi. Di', qual Polidoro è questi? Dal capo ai piè m' è corso un gelo, Euriso, Che instupidita m' ha.	*Mer.* Nella Messenia? e perchè mai? *Egi.* Bisogna Credere ai vecchi. *Mer.* Di', come si noma Il padre tuo? di' tosto. *Egi.* L' infelice Chiamasi Polidoro. *Mer.* Polidoro! Dal capo ai piè m' è corso un gelo, Euriso, Che instupidita m' ha[2].

All Lessing's knowledge of Maffei and his drama comes from these two editions. He draws extensively on the Dedication to the Duke of Modena, which is reprinted in both, but the footnotes only appear in the later edition, and Lessing's references to Plutarch's *De esu carnium* and *De capienda ex inimicis utilitate* (in St. xxxvii, p. 338, and St. xxxix, p. 348, note) are from these. From the Dedication come the following passages: St. xxxvii, pp. 337 f.; St. xxxix, pp. 349 f.; St. xl, p. 353 ('Auch hatten, schon in dem sechszehnten Jahrhunderte... sein ganzes Stück zu beleben'); St. xlii, p. 362; p. 363. From Becelli's own introduction to his edition Lessing draws the beginning of his forty-first Stück, namely, the reference to Leonardo Adami and the lines: 'Cedite Romani scriptores' etc.; also the information about the early success of *Merope*, although Lessing also consulted here Riccoboni's *Histoire du Théâtre italien*, where he found (i, p. 82): 'Je donnai la *Mérope* du même Marquis *Maffei*; on ne sçauroit exprimer le bruit qu'elle fit et les applaudissemens qu'elle reçut; il s'en fit quatre Editions dans la même année.'

---

[1] He may also have known the edition in Diodati's *Biblioteca teatrale italiana*, ix (1764) (cp. *Dramaturgie*, St. viii, ed. Lachmann-Muncker, p. 36; St. xii, p. 56), but this is merely a reprint of the text of 1730. G. Hartmann (*Merope im italienischen und französischen Drama*, Erlangen, 1892, p. 57) suggests the possibility of Lessing having used a Turin edition of 1765; but I have examined this edition, and its text does not correspond with Lessing's quotations.

[2] In the edition published at Verona in 1747, the text of which is that of the first edition, Maffei states expressly (p. 118): 'Nelle prime Edizioni diceva Egisto, Ah Polidoro, Tu mel dicesti un dì etc. E Merope, Polidoro! Chi sei? etc. Gli amici dell' Autore vollero, ch' Ei levasse tal nome da quel sito, dicendo non esser naturale, che un Figliuolo in vece di dire, ah Padre, lo chiami per nome. Si ha però in altri Edizioni: Mel disse il Padre mio,' etc. Lessing could not have known either this edition or that of 1745, for they contain Maffei's reply to Voltaire, and from St. xlii, p. 304, it is clear that Lessing was not aware of the existence of this reply.

Lessing's knowledge about Maffei himself comes partly from the poet's own 'Proemio' (only in the later edition), and partly from Becelli. Cp. St. xlii (p. 360):

Maffei hatte in seiner Jugend viel Neigung zur Poesie; er machte mit vieler Leichtigkeit Verse, in allen verschiednen Stilen der berühmtesten Dichter seines Landes: doch diese Neigung und diese Leichtigkeit beweisen für das eigentliche Genie, welches zur Tragödie erfodert wird, wenig oder nichts. Hernach legte er sich auf die Geschichte, auf Kritik und Alterthümer; und ich zweifle, ob diese Studien die rechte Nahrung für das tragische Genie sind. Er war unter Kirchenväter und Diplomen vergraben, und schrieb wider die Pfaffe und Basnagen, als er, auf gesellschaftliche Veranlassung, seine Merope vor die Hand nahm, und sie in weniger als zwey Monaten zu Stande brachte.

(*Proemio*): L' autore della presente Tragedia all' anno dell' età sua trentesimo ottavo arrivato era, senza avere a metter mano in Tragica Poesia pensato pure un momento già mai: anzi ogni spezie di Componimento, siccome all' arte Poetica fin da fanciullo fortemente inclinato: negli anni suoi giovanili tentato avea, fuorchè questa.

(Becelli): E per verità a nissun genere di studio il nostro Autore ha pensato meno, che a questo, anzi quanto ne sia stato lontano da...quanto contra il Pfaff, e contra il Basnage ha scritto, e dalle Storia de' Diplomi, e dall' altre opere si può arguire: ed è notissimo, come questi componimenti per occasioni nate, e per compiacere a Compagnie nobili, e ad onestissime conversazioni da lui speditamente fatti furono....Si sa da molti, che meno di due mesi l' Autore v' impiegò.

Lessing is further indebted to the 'Proemio' for the passage in St. xlii (p. 362: 'Als Litterator hat er zu viel...er sie überträgt') as well as for the suggested re-arrangement of the text of Hyginus which is contained in his note to St. xl (p. 352). The passage in St. xxxix (p. 349: 'und aus ein Paar andern...macht mir der Titel selbst') would seem to have been suggested by Orsi's 'Avvertimento' to Maffei's drama; while in discussing Euripides's indebtedness to Socrates in St. xlix (p. 393) Lessing possibly owed something to Sebastiano Paoli's 'Ragionamenti,' which were included in the later editions of *Merope*.

The commentators on the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* are unanimous in discovering another reference to Maffei in that work. In Stück xxxii Lessing says (p. 318): 'Hernach lebte, zu Anfange des itzigen Jahrhunderts, irgendwo in Italien, ein Pedant, der hatte den Kopf von den Trauerspielen der Griechen und seiner Landsleute des sechszehnten Seculi voll, und der fand an der Rodogune gleichfals vieles auszusetzen.' On the ground that Maffei wrote *Osservazioni sulla Rodoguna* in 1700 (published in 1719), this is held to refer to Maffei. But it was far from likely that Lessing should have described a well-known writer, intimately associated with Verona and then little more than ten years dead, as having 'lived somewhere in Italy at the beginning of the century'; nor was there any ground for saying that Maffei's head was 'full of the tragedies of the Greeks,' although he had edited some plays by his countrymen of the sixteenth century. The word 'Pedant,' moreover, seems inapplicable to a writer of whom it is said in Stück xlii that he had 'in seiner Jugend viel Neigung zur Poesie,' and that he made 'mit vieler Leichtigkeit Verse, in allen verschiednen Stilen der berühmtesten Dichter seines Landes,' etc. I am confident that the reference here is not to Maffei, but to Count Pietro dei Conti di Calepio, the unnamed author of the *Paragone della Poesia tragica d' Italia con quella di Francia*, published by Bodmer at Zürich in 1732. In this little volume there is much about the Greek and early Italian drama, and *Rodogune* is severely handled. F. Braitmaier has already discussed the influence of Calepio on the earlier Correspondence between Lessing, Nicolai and Mendelssohn[1], and O. Walzel, in his review of that work, has sought to trace the influence of the *Paragone* on the *Dramaturgie*[2]. The chief points of contact between Calepio and Lessing are the following: Corneille, says Lessing (St. lxxv), finding that his dramas were in many respects at variance with the Aristotelian canon, proceeded to 's'accommoder avec Aristote,' by twisting Aristotle's meaning to meet his own requirements. This is the starting-point for the *Paragone*. Both critics lay weight on the difficulty of reconciling *Rodogune* with Aristotle's views. Both Lessing and Calepio condemn the sophistry of Corneille's 'pity *or* fear,' instead of 'pity *and* fear'; and both express their surprise at Dacier's oversight (St. lxxvi)[1]. Calepio, however, accepts the Corneille-Dacier interpretation of the 'katharsis' as the purification of *all* passions, not merely fear, compassion and their like. He is in agreement with Lessing in repudiating Corneille's claim for admiration as a tragic emotion. Lessing's polemic in St. lxxxiii against Corneille's explanation of 'good character' as meaning 'le caractère brillant et élevé d'une habitude vertueuse ou criminelle, selon qu'elle est propre et convenable à la personne qu'on introduit,' is similar in many respects to Calepio's, Chap. v, Art. 2. Both writers quote in this connection Le Bossu, although this reference is to be found in Dacier, and both show that Corneille's argument may lead to the glorification of vice. Thus Lessing's anti-Cornelian criticism follows in its general lines that of the author of the *Paragone.* The similarities might, of course, be individually explained on the ground that the subject of both Lessing's and Calepio's attack was the *Discours* of Corneille, that both critics had before them Dacier's Aristotle commentary, and were familiar with the trend of French anti-Cornelian criticism; but the coincidences are too numerous and the methods of attack too similar to make this explanation altogether acceptable. Actual textual correspondences, on the other hand, are difficult to find. In Lessing's discussion of *Rodogune* there is possibly an echo of Calepio when he says (St. xxx, p. 310) that Medea is 'gegen Cleopatra tugendhaft und liebenswürdig' (Calepio, p. 33: 'Dal fatto, perciocchè Seleuco uno de' figliuoli muore trucidato per sua mano e con fierezza vie più di quella di Medea intolerabile'); and in his criticism of Thomas Corneille's *Essex* there is again possibly a reminiscence of the Italian: St. xxiv, p. 283: 'Den Grafen zu einem seufzenden Liebhaber...nur haben konnte' and Calepio, p. 85: 'Tommaso Cornelio deprava il costume del Co. d' Essec col renderlo pazzo d' amore, e farlo morire più per disperazione, che per la grandezza dell' animo.'

---

[1] *Geschichte der poetischen Theorie und Kritik, von den Diskursen der Maler bis auf Lessing*, Frauenfeld, 1888, i, pp. 189 ff.

[2] *Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum*, xvii, 1891, pp. 55 ff. Cp. also L. Donati, *Bodmer und die italienische Literatur*, in the *Bodmer-Denkschrift*, Zürich, 1900, pp. 261 ff., and A. Galletti, *Le teorie drammatiche e la tragedia in Italia nel sec. XVIII*, i, Cremona, 1901, pp. 222 ff. E. Bertana, *Il Teatro tragico italiano del Sec. XVIII* (Suppl. to the *Giornale stor. della lett. ital.*, iv, 1901), p. 94, denies any connection between Calepio and Lessing.

As Walzel rightly says, it would have been strange had Lessing not known the one treatise of his time which was most in sympathy with his own point of view. He was certainly familiar in 1756 with Bodmer's correspondence with Calepio, *Briefwechsel von der Natur des poetischen Geschmackes,* and he also knew Bodmer's *Critische Briefe* (1746)[2], which contain a very loose *résumé* of Calepio's *Paragone.* This, if nothing else, must have attracted him to the book itself.

LONDON. J. G. ROBERTSON.

---

[1] Cp. article on 'Lessing's Interpretation of Aristotle,' *Modern Language Review,* XII, 1917, p. 327.

[2] Lessing refers to this book in his *Abhandlung von dem Wesen der Fabel* (*Schriften,* vii, p. 441).

GRILLPARZER'S 'DES MEERES UND DER LIEBE WELLEN' AND HOUWALD'S 'DER LEUCHTTURM.'

The relationship of these two plays has, we believe, not yet been noticed or discussed by critics of Grillparzer. *Der Leuchtturm* is a two-act tragedy written in the trochaic metre which Grillparzer employed in *Die Ahnfrau* and *Der Traum ein Leben.* It combines an idyllic romance of a lighthouse-keeper's daughter Dorothea and her lover Walther with a fantastic tale of passion and ingratitude, in which Walther's mother and a Graf von Holm are involved. The drama was first produced in Dresden in 1820, and was played altogether seventeen times at the Hofburgtheater in Vienna between January 8, 1822 and August 30, 1825[1].

The first act of *Der Leuchtturm* offers several points of comparison with Grillparzer's play. The scene is the upper part of the lighthouse in a small room into which at night the light shines down from the tower. Caspar, the keeper of the lighthouse, tries to persuade his daughter to take the veil; but she, having seen Walther on the shore, is unwilling to conform with his wishes. Grillparzer's Hero, too, is urged by her father to dedicate herself to the service of the gods; but in her case the awakening comes after the fatal step has been taken. There has been discord between Hero's parents owing to the extreme selfishness of her father; and in Houwald's play stress is laid on the unhappiness which common guilt has brought on Walther's mother and the Graf. In both plays it is the mother who suffers and who strives against fate to set matters right. Hero, as Dorothea, is looking out over the sea when her musings are interrupted by the entrance of her lover, Leander's appearance in the tower being as sudden and unexpected as Walther's. More closely analogous is the rôle played by the lamp in both dramas. It is the lamp, 'ein kleiner Stern, wie eine letzte Hoffnung,' which guides Leander to Hero's tower; and it is the lamp of the lighthouse which inspires hope in Walther's heart when, tossed by wind and wave, he expects every minute to meet his doom:

> Denn gleich einem milden Sterne
> Glänzt der Leuchtturm aus der Ferne.

In *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen* there are two contrasting scenes in which the lamp figures, one of awakening happiness and calm, the other of approaching disaster and storm; in Houwald there is only the storm. The catastrophe depends in both plays on the extinguishing of the light; and in both cases it is the heroine's uncle who extinguishes it. In Grillparzer this uncle is the high-priest; he is solicitous for his niece's welfare as he understands it, and zealous in carrying out the duties of the temple. Houwald's Dorothea has at her side the old and feeble brother of her father, who, half-crazed with grief, is as zealous in his purpose as the priest in Grillparzer. Dorothea, holding watch in the tower, pities the old man and asks: Has he seen:

---

[1] Cp. E. Wlassak, *Chronik des k. k. Hofburgtheaters*, Vienna, 1876, p. 312.

> Keines Leuchtturms helle Flammen,
> Wo die Liebe für dich wacht?

Hero, who keeps 'der Liebe süsse Wacht,' thinks only of Leander till weariness overcomes her and she falls asleep; when the priest places her lamp where the storm will blow it out. In Houwald's play Dorothea's uncle creeps in while she and her lover are oblivious to their surroundings and extinguishes the light. Hero laments passionately when she finds her lover's guiding star gone; Dorothea wrings her hands in despair when she realises that her neglect of her duty has resulted in a shipwreck. There is little in common between the dénouements of the two plays except perhaps the finding of the body—in Houwald that of Walther's mother, in Grillparzer Leander's—on the shore; but this was a traditional feature in the Greek story. There is, however, some similarity in the close of both plays. Dorothea's uncle and Walther's mother are joined in death, as are Hero and Leander. The Graf speaks of them as 'selig dort vereint,' while Ianthe in Grillparzer voices her thoughts in the words: 'Zwei Leichen und ein Grab. O gönnt es ihnen!'

ALICE A. SCOTT.

LONDON.

REVIEWS.

A Register of Middle English Religious and Didactic Verse. By CARLETON BROWN. *Part I. List of Manuscripts.* Oxford: Printed for the Bibliographical Society at the University Press. 1916 xv + 528 pp.

Among the many benefits which the late Dr Furnivall has conferred on students of Middle English literature, not the least is the suggestion, made by him in the summer of 1908, to which Professor Carleton Brown tells us the inception of the present work is due. There is no need to dilate on the desirability of such an undertaking. All too familiar is the experience, which few delvers in the field of mediaeval English verse have been fortunate enough to escape, not merely of vexatious loss of time in fruitless search, but, far worse, of a haunting doubt that the quest, when at last brought to an end, may not have been really exhaustive. The serious student can never hope for complete deliverance from either of these troubles, which are incidental to his calling; but Professor Brown's *Register*, when complete, will reduce them both to insignificance, so far as concerns the large and important area to the 'sweeping-up' of which he has devoted himself.

Professor Brown has taken as his task the construction of a complete bibliography of the extant materials in Middle English religious and didactic verse, basing his work on the manuscripts rather than printed texts, since the former 'must always constitute the final and unchanging basis for our knowledge of this early literature.' Accordingly, his first step was to examine all accessible manuscripts which he knew to contain, or suspected of containing, matter for his purpose. In the present volume he publishes the results of this examination in the shape of what he modestly calls a 'list,' but might with justice and propriety have called a detailed catalogue, of the manuscripts; forming, in fact, the *pièces justificatives* for Part II, which will consist mainly of 'an alphabetical index of first lines, with citation under each entry of all manuscripts containing the piece in question and with references to printed texts in the case of those which have already been published,' and will also include an index of subjects and titles. It will thus be seen that the more essential part of the work, from the point of view of direct utility, is yet to come. Its final preparation, however, must necessarily require much time and labour and thought; and pending its completion the publication of Part I is to be welcomed, both as an earnest of the approaching appearance of Part II, and also as constituting in itself a valuable contribution to knowledge and aid to the student (the present reviewer speaks with conviction, having himself consulted the 'List' with profit more than once, before he has had the grace to utter this tardy word of thanks to the compiler).

The scope of this Register has been restricted to religious and didactic verse, on practical grounds whose cogency is undeniable. Regrettable though the exclusion of secular verse is in itself, it must be accepted, even welcomed, as tending sensibly to facilitate the accomplishment of Professor Brown's task, vast and laborious as it is even so; and we may hope, perhaps, that later he will deal with the secular verse in a separate publication. The demarcation of boundary-lines presents its difficulties here, as in all systems of literary classification, especially with regard to the distinction between secular and didactic verse. In his introduction Professor Brown sets forth with admirable clearness his method of grappling with these difficulties; and none but the captious would find matter for complaint either in the method or in its practical application. Thus Lydgate's *Fall of Princes* is included as 'being essentially didactic in purpose,' while Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, though its framework is arranged on the scheme of the Deadly Sins, is excluded because 'the narratives themselves so far outweigh in interest the didactic framework' as to stamp the poem secular. Again, the *Canterbury Tales* are regarded as one work (naturally, of the secular class), and so excluded, despite the religious character of the Prioress's and Second Nun's Tales; these, however, are mentioned when they occur separately. The chronological limits of the Register are roughly 1200 to 1500; but Professor Brown has done well to include many sixteenth century copies of earlier compositions.

In point of orderly simplicity of arrangement, the 'List of Manuscripts' leaves nothing to be desired; the manuscripts being described according to the sequence of their catalogue-numbers in the several libraries consulted, which include practically all the public and semi-public libraries and known private collections in the British Isles and the United States, besides a few on the Continent. In point of execution, it is characterized by the scholarly and workmanlike thoroughness, the unobtrusive erudition, which all familiar with Professor Brown's work will expect. Every manuscript is described in detail, the first line of each piece being quoted (where the beginning is defective, the standard first line is also quoted for reference—an excellent and most useful practice, for the full benefits of which we must of course await the appearance of Part II). Among other commendable features is the treatment as separate units of the several component parts (varying as they do in the different manuscripts) of the South English Legendary and the Northern Homily Collection. It would be difficult to overpraise the unstinted toil and wide knowledge revealed (to those who know something of the joys and sorrows of cataloguing) on almost every page by the identification of stray fragments or short extracts. A remarkable instance of this is the paraphrase of *Handlyng Synne* (by the way, why does Professor Brown so often call it *Handlyng* of *Synne?*) contained in Arundel MS. 20, which Professor Brown has recognized (p. 259) as Book II of Peter Idle's *Instructions*.

There are a few trifling omissions, which will doubtless be made good in Part II. The most noteworthy of those which the present reviewer has detected is a sixteenth century copy of the precepts 'Arise erli; Serve God devovteli,' etc., in Stowe MS. 850, f. 1. In a few cases no date has been assigned to the manuscripts (e.g. on pp. 257, 311, 330).

J. A. HERBERT.

LONDON.

The Liturgical Element in the earliest Forms of the Medieval Drama with special reference to the English and German plays. (University of Minnesota Studies in Language and Literature No. 4.) By PAUL EDWARD KRETZMANN. Minneapolis: Bulletin of the University of Minnesota. 1916. 8vo. vii + 170 pp.

Ever since Mone and Alt began thorough investigations the connexion between medieval drama and the Roman liturgy has been considered as established beyond dispute. Hitherto, however, detailed studies have dealt almost exclusively with one portion of this connexion, the growth of the trope and its expansion by means of homiletic material. That other liturgical elements fulfilled the same function as the tropes has, I think, been tacitly assumed by more than one critic, but has lacked demonstration. Mr Kretzmann has provided this, and his thorough and painstaking work thus meets a real need in revealing the part played in the structure of church-plays and mysteries by responses, versicles and antiphonal tags.

This is all the author professes to do, but many indirect results follow from the establishment and demonstration of the main thesis. The most comprehensive of these is the presumption, not to say certainty, it sets up of absolute uniformity in the development of each group of religious plays on lines already familiar in the instance of the Resurrection plays. This, in its turn, brings many implications with it and works considerable havoc among earlier theories based on less copious material than that Mr Kretzmann has amassed. Thus Sepet's theory that the Old Testament plays owe their origin to an expanded *Prophetae*, a theory strongly attacked by Mr Hardin Craig a few years ago (*Modern Philology*, X, 473 ff.), falls to the ground in the face of abundant evidence for their normal development from the liturgies for Septuagesima and subsequent Sundays (76—88). Similarly, Mr Kretzmann has placed beyond question the evolution of the Eschatological plays out of the Advent services (12—22). And he has done very good work in clearing up much of the confusion that has too long obscured the *planctus* and their significance for medieval drama (89—115). Professor Wechssler's theory (*Die romanischen Marienklagen*, 1893, 100 ff.), accepted by Mr E. K. Chambers (*The Mediaeval Stage*, 1903, II, 40), but already impugned by Mr G. C. Taylor (*Modern Philology*, IV, 636 ff.), to the effect that in them we must see the one and only germ of the Passion plays, is shown to be untenable when confronted with evidence for perfectly normal growth parallel to that of liturgical plays for other holy days (86—115). A similar demonstration, lastly, gives a sharp set-back to the importance of the Gospel of Nicodemus in the determination of the Harrowing of Hell plays (116–33).

The second broad inference Mr Kretzmann compels us to acknowledge is the insignificant direct influence of the Vulgate on medieval playwrights. The Chester mystery-cycle affords two good examples of this (cited 104) by making Peter's Denial follow the Condemnation by Pilate and by bringing the Mary Magdalene scene into connexion with the Last Supper, in agreement, that is to say, with the liturgy, but in contradiction to the gospel-narrative. Occasionally, however, it seems to me, Mr Kretzmann lays undue emphasis on this part of his finding. The difficulties, for instance, occasioned by the position of the Purification plays (68—72) in the mystery-cycles may surely be explained in great part by the discrepancy between the version Matthew gives of the incidents following the Nativity and that to be found in Luke.

In judging Mr Kretzmann's dissertation as a whole we should not lose sight of the extreme modesty of his main thesis, 'to show more fully and conclusively than has hitherto been done' (10) the liturgical traces in the religious drama of the West, nor, at the same time, of the necessity he was under, from this very unpretentiousness, of accumulating a vast body of material, indifferent evidence as well as good. As the result, we must frankly confess, the book is unreadable as an essay and unwieldy as a monograph. As a work of reference it suffers fatally from the lack of an index. Considering the difficulties, the proof-reading and so forth has left little to desire. Two things require alteration: the first edition of H. Alt's *Der christliche Cultus* was 1843 (I think *Theater und Kirche*, 1846, should have been added here) (165); and p. 169, l. 4, *for* Canterbury *read* Cambridge. Lastly, I must protest against Mr Kretzmann's curious ideas of nomenclature: titles like 'Mittelniederländisches Osterspiel of Mastricht' (*passim*) are unnecessary and 'Passio de Frankfort' (p. 22, l. 7) seems to me bad Latin, French, English and German.

B. W. DOWNS.

CAMBRIDGE.

Richard Cumberland, His Life and Dramatic Works. By STANLEY THOMAS WILLIAMS, Ph.D. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. 1917. viii + 365 pp.

Although something less than a century and a half ago Richard Cumberland was one of the most prolific of English writers, although there is scarcely a province in literature he did not essay again and again —often with no little meed of contemporary success—for the generality of readers now-a-days he lives only in the immortal figure of Sir Fretful Plagiary. His fifty-eight plays, tragedies, comedies, interludes, masques, entertainments; his novels; his poems, pastorals, odes, epics; his descriptive catalogues, translations and occasional papers; 'peaceably forgot,' have one and all passed 'to the mild Limbo of our Father Tate.' And yet in the theatre *The Brothers*, *The West Indian*, *The Fashionable Lover*, *The Jew*, *The Wheel of Fortune*, attained great popularity. They were reprinted time after time, and they duly appear in all the stock collections of English plays, in Bell, Mrs Inchbald, Dibdin, Oxberry, Lacy, and the rest. Of the novels Sir Walter Scott liberally praised *Arundel* and *Henry*, and magnanimously refrained from dwelling on the portentously wearisome *John de Lancaster*. But Dr Williams has exactly hit the mark in the excellent study before us when he says that he 'ends his work to-day, believing that the real interest of his book lies less in the plays than in the personality of their author.'

It must be confessed that the second half of the eighteenth century was indeed a melancholy period in the history of our drama. The stage suffered from the blighting influence of an affected sentimentalism, *la comédie larmoyante*. Decade after decade of stagnation crept by. Nerveless dialogue, flabby characters, insipid situations were received with silly applause and sillier tears. Hugh Kelly, William Whitehead, Philip Francis, and a score beside exhibited their maudlin Josephs and piping heroines, their banal old fathers and amiable matrons, on the boards where once Dorimant had courted Belinda and Harriet Woodvil, where my Lord Foppington had made love to Amanda before her husband's face, and that superb coquette Millamant exchanged scintillating repartee with her lovesick Mirabell. So universal was the mediocrity of those fifty years that Murphy's *The Way to Keep Him* and *All in the Wrong*, plays of jog-trot humour, perceptibly stand out from the rank and file, whilst mildly amusing but certainly quite second-rate comedies such as *The Jealous Wife* and *The Clandestine Marriage* seem almost brilliant, and that tawdry piece of patches and purloined wit, *The School for Scandal*, achieved a glamour and a reputation which have endured even until to-day.

There can be no question that, although many causes contributed to this decline, one of the moving spirits whose influence so woefully emasculated and degraded the stage was David Garrick. Great actor he doubtless was—not so great perhaps as flattering critics and sugary biographers have painted him—but in every other direction his ascendancy was simply deplorable. For all his vaunted veneration for Shakespeare no man has ever so shamefully mangled the plays. As Theophilus Cibber smartly wrote: '*The Midsummer Night's Dream* has been minc'd and fricaseed into a thing, called the *Fairies*, *The Winter's Tale* mammock'd into a Droll, and, *The Tempest* castrated into an Opera.' The tragedies suffered equally, and still we have not reckoned half his sins. We can but regard with distrust and contempt the manager who in 1751 substituted a horribly distorted rifacimento of *Eastward Hoe* for *The London Cuckolds*—one is glad to know that the audience hooted their new fare off the stage—who in 1754 was tinkering with and, as far as lay in his power, spoiling Buckingham's exquisitely happy version of *The Chances*, and who, worst of all, in 1766 replaced perhaps the greatest of all English comedies, *The Country Wife*, in which his more than rival, Quin, had been so pre-eminent, by *The Country Girl*, an alteration that, as Genest very truly but all too kindly remarks, is 'insipid to the last degree.'

Richard Cumberland was only too ready to help in this downhill work. His comedies, one and all, are flowery or bald in dialogue, stilted in moral, monotonous in incident, saturated with the most exuberant effusions of gushing sentiment, hopelessly incapable of rousing the slightest interest from the first line to the last. Occasionally a great actor, Yates in Sir Benjamin Dove, John Bannister or Robert Elliston in Sheva, Kemble in Penruddock, would with difficulty galvanize his scenes into something like life. But it may be recalled that when *The Jew* was experimentally revived for one performance May 8th, 1917, in spite of some admirable work, it proved a very tiresome business. Of Cumberland's tragedies the less said the better. As Dr Williams, one of the tenderest of critics, remarks with regard to *The Carmelite*: It 'is by far the best of Cumberland's tragedies in verse, yet, after all, it is a bad tragedy. No blindness can condone its tottering structure, its wooden plot, or doleful sentimentalism.' *The Mysterious Husband*, the best of Cumberland's domestic prose tragedies, gropes after but never attains actuality, and remains a disjointed, unreal, verbose piece of puppetry.

With all his faults however Cumberland cut an important figure in his day, and no student of the English theatre can ignore his dramatic achievement. His comedies must be examined, and in detail. It is this which Dr Williams has so amply done, and we are very grateful to him for having undertaken, and so meticulously fulfilled, the task. It has been performed throughout with a care and zeal worthy of all praise, with a generosity of estimation which we can at least recognise and acknowledge, although we are unable to endorse. The fact is, Cumberland was a dull dog, but Dr Williams has made him the subject of a very interesting and acute study, which is of itself no easy feat.

It must not be supposed that Cumberland was heavy only when he touched the drama. He was capable of the most leaden essays and cumbrous chapters. There are some remarks of his which were published in 1817 as a preface to a reprint of Garrick's meddlesome recension of Buckingham's version of *The Chances*. Mr E. K. Chambers says: 'Scholars are unanimous in regarding the [original] play as practically the unaided work of Fletcher.' It will be remembered that Buckingham's alterations commence towards the end of Act III, and he has substituted for the last two acts, two quite new acts of his own written in prose, which are, it is generally allowed, far wittier and more brilliant than even those written by Fletcher. Cumberland, regarding this version of an adaptation before him, as the work of Beaumont and Fletcher, gravely assigns the first two acts and the one half of act three to Fletcher, the prose portion to Beaumont. This judgement, we take it, ranks amongst the idlest pieces of nonsense ever penned. His criticisms also of such masterpieces as *Love for Love*, *Venice Preserv'd*, *Oroonoko*, *The Way of the World*, *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife*, are actually ludicrous in their fatuity.

Dr Williams discusses the very interesting point how nearly Richard Cumberland was the model from which Sir Fretful Plagiary was drawn. He is inclined to think that the sketch of Sir Fretful may be eclectic, and that several dramatists contributed features for the portrait. But when we have the evidence of *The Town and Country Magazine*, November 1779, of *The Lady's Magazine* for the same month and year, of Watkins' *Memoirs of Sheridan*, not to mention many other contemporary and traditional authorities, it seems beyond a doubt that Sir Fretful was not even a caricature, but rather the most photographic figure possible, exhibiting in every detail the mortified vanity and affected contempt which the acid and thin-skinned author of *The West Indian* showed only too plainly under any criticism, however lenient and well meant. The first act of *The Critic*, it may be observed, contains Sheridan's finest piece of comic writing, and is incontestably far superior to those comedies, which, generally considered his masterpieces, are in truth very empty shadows of the stage of the great dramatists who had written three quarters of a century before.

There are in Dr Williams' admirable study two or three slips, but these are generally of a trifling nature. A rather more serious mistake is that on p. 86. Dennis Brulgruddery does not appear in Sir Robert Howard's *The Committee* (folio 1665, acted 1663), but in Colman's *John Bull* (produced at Covent Garden, 5 March, 1803). On p. 153 we have: '*The Bondman*...[was] revived under Betterton's direction in 1719.' Betterton died 28th April, 1710, and was buried 2nd May in Westminster Abbey cloisters. Pepys saw Betterton act Pisander (*The Bondman*) 1st March, 1661, and on subsequent occasions. In the revival at Drury Lane, 8th June, 1719, Walker played the title-rôle. On p. 98 we are told 'Mrs Centlivre and Charles Macklin had preceded Cumberland in creating Scotch characters for the stage.' In John Tatham's tragedy *The Distracted State*, written in 1641, printed 1651, we have a Scotch mountebank, who speaks an uncouth jargon, and several scenes between Jocky, Billy, and Scarefool, in the same author's *The Scots Figgaries: or, a Knot of Knaves* (4to 1652) are written in a similar pseudo-dialect. In 1667 Lacy the actor produced a travesty of *The Taming of the Shrew*, to which he added a Scottish character, Sawney, which became immensely popular. Pepys however on seeing the play found that 'the best part, Sawny, done by Lacy, hath not half its life, by reason of the words, I suppose, not being understood, at least by me.' Lacy's alteration was printed in 1698.

Dr Williams tells us that he has prepared an exhaustive account of Cumberland's dramatic work even including the stage-history of the more obscure plays. This no doubt will be of great value, and taken in conjunction with his present able study will amply cover a very wide period in the history of our English drama, and one that till recently has not been critically explored or presented in any detail.

MONTAGUE SUMMERS.

LONDON.

Joseph Ritson, a Critical Biography. By HENRY ALFRED BURD. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. II, No. 3.) Urbana: The University of Illinois. 1916. 8vo. 224 pp.

The life of an indefatigable and uncompromising scholar, and of such an original 'humourist' as Joseph Ritson, cannot fail to be interesting to those of the younger generations who share in the same studies. Modern philologists often need to be reminded of their ancestors who made explorations and cleared the way. Ritson is distinguished among the antiquaries of his time for his principles of evidence and proof and his requirement of accuracy in editing. The paradoxes of his character, his acrimony and his generosity, his minute attention to dull particulars and his enjoyment of poetry and romance, make him better worth remembering the better he is known. His habit of railing accusation, his skill in 'flyting,' did not mean mischief in any dishonourable way. Mr Burd in his biography has done justice to Ritson by not concealing his extravagances in controversy, while he appreciates fairly his talent as a judge of literature and imagination. Ritson on *Hamlet*, quoted here p. 84 *sqq.*, may be contrasted with Ritson's sentences on Warton, Percy and Pinkerton.

Scott's opinion of Ritson is to be trusted: 'allowing for a certain portion of irritability (a constitutional *disease*) he possessed, in a degree surpassing his contemporaries, the patience, the candour, and the industry necessary for antiquarian researches. He was firm, and somewhat obstinate in his opinions, as was natural in one who had adopted them after much thought. But he piqued himself on the most perfect honesty in research and quotation, and, if you brought him sufficient evidence to convince him of his error, he was the first to avow his conviction to the world. His violence, though often to be regretted, was always sincere and unaffected.'

This is from Scott's article on Ritson's *Caledonians* in the *Quarterly Review*, July, 1829 (*Prose Works*, Vol. 20, p. 301 *sqq.*), a paper not mentioned in Mr Burd's bibliography. There are many places in Mr Burd's volume where some addition or emendation might be suggested. What does Mr Burd mean on p. 169: 'The first mention of the Picts is about 300, when they are referred to by Caesar, Tacitus, and others as enemies to the Britons'? Ritson is dead; but does not Mr Burd hear him saying what he thinks of this?

On p. 57 it is not only 'their ilk' which surprises: 'This skepticism sometimes placed him in ridiculous positions, but it proved to be not wholly a negative quality in the days of Chatterton, Rowley, Ireland, and their ilk; and Ritson was not in the least deceived by any of these clever forgers.'

On p. 137: 'He did not connect "The Knight of Curtesy and the Fair Lady of Faguell" with the "Chatelain de Coucy," upon which it is founded.' But he, Ritson, did: *Romanceës* III, p. 353.

Ibidem: Mr Burd affirms that Percy had printed *Sir Lybeaus* in his *Reliques* 'as from a copy in his folio manuscript' and surmises that

Ritson printed the same romance 'for the double purpose of discomfiting Percy and exhibiting a more perfect copy of the romance.' The first modern edition of *Sir Lybeaus* was Ritson's, from MS. *Caligula* II. Percy gave a summary of the story, but his text had to wait till Hales and Furnivall edited the Percy Folio. Mr Burd, it is pretty obvious, has confused *Sir Lybeaus* with the *Marriage of Sir Gawaine*, which occupies so large a part of Ritson's preliminary Dissertation.

The fault of this work generally is insufficient interest in the studies which meant so much and were so real to Ritson. If Mr Burd had followed the guidance of Ritson in any track through the Middle Ages he would have known something more of the work of Ritson's contemporaries, and Leyden would have come into his story not as he here most singularly is described on p. 125, 'Dr John Leyden, the crude Scottish poet.' Is 'crude' suggested by Leyden's exploit at Lasswade in eating raw meat for the instruction of Ritson? It would have been pertinent if Mr Burd had written a few sentences on that work of Leyden which shows him travelling in the same way as Ritson: his remarkable edition of the *Complaint of Scotland*. And something might have been learned as to the relations of all the parties from Mrs MacCunn's *Friends of Sir Walter Scott*.

LONDON. W. P. KER.

Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom. Second Series, vol. XXXV. *Report of the Royal Society of Literature and List of Fellows* 1917. London: Humphrey Milford. 1917. 8vo. 179 + 88 pp.

The present volume contains seven out of the eight papers read to the Royal Society of Literature during the session 1916—1917. Of these, two deal with subjects taken from Italian literature—'The Romantic Age in Italian Literature' by Dr Cippico and 'Dante and Boethius' by Bishop Boyd-Carpenter—one with the Spanish poet Góngora by Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly, one with modern Hindustani Drama by Mr A. Yusuf Ali, and the three others with English subjects; Professor J. Holland Rose writes on 'The Motives in Carlyle's "French Revolution",' Mr A. E. Morgan traces the 'Currents of English Drama in the Eighteenth Century,' while from the Rev. Montague Summers we have a study of Ann Radcliffe. An eighth paper by Dr Piccoli on 'Rhythm in English and Italian Literature' which was apparently read to the Society in December, 1916, is for some reason not included. If it had been, Italian literature would have claimed an even higher proportion of the contents of the present volume than it does already. This fact gains interest when taken in connexion with the report of the Society's Foreign Secretary printed in the General Report for 1917 at the end of the book, in which he states as chief among the activities of his Committee during the past twelve months the starting and nurturing of a project for founding a professorship of Italian studies, 'the first of its kind in the British Empire, which we hope very soon to see established at the Empire's heart.'

Space forbids more than the briefest account of the above mentioned papers, which in any case no one individual would be competent to criticise in detail, where the ground covered is so wide and various and each writer can claim more or less expert knowledge of his subject.

Dr Cippico in his paper on the Romantic Age in Italian Literature would have done better had he assumed in his hearers a knowledge of the meaning of the term Romanticism instead of spending valuable time and space in trying to define it. He never succeeds in being really clear on the subject, and consequently we cannot be sure what he means when he detects in Parini a 'profound diversity of artistic tendencies,' classical and romantic mingled, and when he calls Alfieri a 'romantic in the truest sense of the word.' Alone of the lecturers in this volume Dr Cippico seems to have attempted, for the limits set him, too vast a subject and too ambitious a style. Dr Boyd Carpenter's study of 'Dante and Boethius' is, as might have been expected, a most felicitous combination of knowledge of his subject with charm and suggestiveness of treatment. 'Why did the "Consolations" attract Dante?' he asks, and after discussing the manner in which Dante acknowledges his debt to Boethius, he proceeds to point out the resemblances in thought between the two men, especially their attitude to *das Ewigweibliche* in human life. Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly contributes an illuminating little paper on a difficult subject. He gives a brief résumé of Góngora's life and after reference to the sharp cleavage between the poet's early style and the deliberate extravagance and intentional freakishness of his later manner, discusses the question of the origin of the theory embodied in *culteranismo*, and indicates its influence upon subsequent literature. 'At his best Góngora is not a Góngorist,' though we are warned that after a long period of undeserved misprision Góngora's work is now in danger of being no less unreasonably overestimated.

Mr Yusuf Ali's paper on modern Hindustani Drama probably breaks fresh ground for most English readers. He deals with the acting profession and the theatre as well as the drama itself, its sources, traditions, and prospects for the future. These are hopeful, as 'sentimentality and artificiality are gradually yielding to a healthy living interest in the actualities of life.' Only the briefest reference is possible to the remaining papers in the volume. Mr Morgan in handling the vast subject of English Drama in the eighteenth century has confined himself to tracing, with great lucidity and skill, the origin and growth of the sentimental play: in his learned and fascinating paper on Ann Radcliffe the Rev. Montague Summers frames a study of that novelist against a background of the 'macabre' in literature generally: Professor J. Holland Rose makes no attempt to appraise the historical or literary qualities of Carlyle's *French Revolution* but investigates the motives which induced Carlyle to write it at all and stamp it with a marked individuality—a theme which he handles with great freshness and ability.

G. L. BICKERSTETH.

LONDON.

The Sounds of Spoken English with Specimen Passages in Phonetic Transcription, and with a Glossary and Index. By WALTER RIPPMANN. New Version, re-written, with many additions. London: J. M. Dent and Sons. 1914. vi + 152 + 232 pp.

Professor Rippmann's new version of his *Sounds of Spoken English* (1906) and *Specimens of English, Spoken, Read and Recited* (1908) presents a number of novel and interesting features. The two works can now be had in one volume; extensive additions have been made to both, and the results of the most recent research have been incorporated. The *Specimens* have been provided with copious notes in which variations of form and stress in the words concerned have been carefully explained. Further, an excellent 'Glossary Index and Concordance' has been added. It comprises about 5000 words with the phonetic transcription of each word stated and references to their occurrence in the *Specimens* and to the paragraph or paragraphs in the *Sounds* which explain their form. This Glossary is a masterpiece of its kind and as far as I know unique in phonetic literature.

In the *Sounds of Spoken English* the part dealing with Standard English has been considerably enlarged, the individual sounds as well as the sounds in connected speech have been more fully treated. For the explanation of unusual or varying forms the evidence of earlier grammarians and writers on elocution and spelling has been drawn upon. A number of Appendices have also been added, dealing in a brief but interesting manner with the Pronunciation of Proper Names, the Pronunciation of Foreign Words, Varieties of English Speech, the Sounds of Child Speech, and Imperfect Rhymes.

There is little in these volumes which calls for criticism or suggestion. In the Bibliography of *Sounds*, pp. 150 ff., the year of publication of the reference books should have been given; *ib.* p. 151, read Laut*d*auer for Laut*l*auer; *ib.* § 25. 22, 'Magdalen' should have been written 'Magdalen(e)' since the former spelling applies to the Oxford College alone; § 30. 172, 'In Scottish words like *capercailzie*, *gaberlunzie*, the *z* is a substitute for an old-fashioned *y* as written in Middle English manuscripts'... This does not explain how the letter *z* came to be used for the [j]-sound. It would have been better if this paragraph had run somewhat as follows: 'In Scottish words like *capercailzie*, *gaberlunzie*, *Dalziell*, the *z* is a printer's substitute for an earlier ȝ, the native English form of the letter *g*, retained in Middle English and Scottish manuscripts to indicate the [j]-sound; in the proper name *Mackenzie* this [j]-sound has become [z] from the spelling'.... § 44. 21, 'In "ladies' speech" [öü] sometimes replaces [ou], carrying with it a suggestion of affectation.' Would it not be correct to add 'and in so-called "Oxford speech"'? § 45. 521, Lieutenant is [lu:tenant] not only in the United States but amongst the ratings of the lower deck throughout the British Navy. We remember Kipling's: '*Do* I know any destroyer-lootenants?' said he. 'This coast's rank with them! Destroyer-lootenants are born stealing... Engineer-Lootenants! They're worse.' (*Fringes of the Fleet*, 1916, p. 50.)

Professor Rippmann may be congratulated on having produced an excellent piece of work, eminently practical, indeed invaluable to foreign students of English, and of great interest to those who need a guidance in their own pronunciation of English.

ANNA C. PAUES.

CAMBRIDGE.

Colloquial English. Part I. 100 *Substitution Tables* by HAROLD E. PALMER. (Heffer's Phonetic Series.) Cambridge: W. Heffer and Son. 1916. xvi + 102 pp.

Mr Harold Palmer's books on Phonetics are remarkable for freshness and originality of outlook and for an admirable lucidity of statement. His *First Course of English Phonetics*, 1917, forms an excellent introduction to the study of elementary English Phonetics. The work before us is an equally excellent introduction to the study of colloquial English by foreigners and others who are in need of models for their everyday speech.

Colloquial English consists of a hundred 'Substitution Tables' in phonetic transcription, followed by the same Tables in ordinary spelling. In the preliminary remarks to these Tables the writer explains 'Substitution' as a system whereby a normal and idiomatic 'sentence can be multiplied almost indefinitely by substituting any of its words or word-groups by (*sic*) others of the same grammatical family and within certain semantic limits' (p. iii). He further gives valuable hints as to the use of the Tables in teaching, and initiating a student in the elements of spoken English, also a List of Phonetic symbols for those unacquainted with the alphabet of the 'Association Phonétique.'

The main idea of Mr Palmer's ingenious system is an attempt to imitate a child's unconscious substitution of newly acquired words for those already familiar to it in a model sentence. The unit is always to be the *idiomatic sentence*, so that the student will not be left to make up wrongly-constructed sentences on the analogy of his own language.

The sentences selected by Mr Palmer are capable of being multiplied and transformed in an almost endless variety and have been worked out by him with great patience and skill. They testify not only to his linguistic knowledge but to his power of seizing upon the essential types of expression in use in a language and so succeed in making his Substitution Tables an excellent introduction to everyday colloquial English speech.

ANNA C. PAUES.

CAMBRIDGE.

Le Mystère d'Adam. Edited by PAUL STUDER. (*Modern Language Texts.* French Series: Mediaeval Section.) Manchester: University Press. 1918. 8vo. lviii + 80 pp.

This edition, by Professor Studer, of *Le Mystère d'Adam* inaugurates the mediaeval French section of the series of texts in Modern Languages now in course of being published in this country for the use of University students. Such a series will be welcomed by every teacher of Mediaeval French who has experienced the extreme difficulty of procuring suitable texts during the last few years either for detailed philological study or for the general reading necessary for the knowledge of any particular period.

No text could have been better chosen for the first one of the series. There are so few accessible documents from which an idea of the early French drama can be formed that any text which helps to elucidate the difficult history of the liturgical drama in France cannot fail to be of the greatest value. The existing German edition (by Karl Grass, Halle, 1891 and 1907, *Romanische Bibliothek*, vi) is now unobtainable; moreover, in his 2nd edition (1907) Dr Grass abandoned the idea of a critical text and gave what was practically a reproduction of the manuscript, accompanied by copious notes, thus rendering his edition of rather doubtful value for the average University student. A new and readable edition therefore supplies a felt need.

As regards the actual text there was not much room left (as Professor Studer remarks) for originality in preparing a new edition after the work of so many commentators had been expended upon it. Those emendations have been adopted 'which best satisfied the exigencies of language, metre and context.' It need hardly be said that many of these conjectures emanate from the fertile brain of H. Suchier, who was never at a loss in divining what was in the mediaeval mind and supplying a missing line. We are glad that at any rate his suggestion for l. 60: *donc est une fol'oie* ('then she is a silly goose') has not been admitted into the text.

Grammatical errors and arbitrary spellings have for the most part been left in the text except in those cases where, for the sake of metre, an emendation was imperative. This seems quite sound, as there is at any rate a considerable probability that the author himself was an Anglo-Norman and therefore responsible for many of these inaccuracies.

In the Introduction Professor Studer deals at some length with the language of the play, differentiating between the contributions of the various scribes and pointing out the traits which seem to have belonged to the original, which he concludes with the majority of critics to have been written in England about the middle of the twelfth century. The first 30 pages of the Introduction the editor devotes to a sketch of the rise of the liturgical drama, showing the twofold source of the earliest 'jeu liturgique,' viz. the introduction of the 'tropes' into the text of the liturgy, and the famous pseudo-Augustinian *Sermo contra judaeos*[1] which gave the model for all the 'processions of prophets' similar to the one in our play following on the two first scenes of Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel. Indeed Professor Studer's idea is that these two first dramatic scenes are merely an expansion and elaboration of the prophetic play. He says—in speaking of the *Sermo*, in which the first prophecy from a chronological point of view was that uttered by Moses —'it was possible to go further back and introduce Abraham...or Abel...above all Adam, who was particularly suited to usher in the procession of prophets, etc.' By this means the number of prophecies would be increased, and gradually certain ones which lent themselves specially to such treatment might be singled out and dramatised more or less elaborately. Then 'as their proportions grew, they might become independent plays.' This view was first put forward by Marius Sepet in his series of essays published in 1877 under the title *Les Prophètes du Christ*, and was subsequently adopted by most critics. It has since been characterised as 'geschmacklos' and held up to ridicule[2] by Wilhelm Meyer (*Fragmenta Burana*...herausgeg. von Wilhelm Meyer, Berlin, 1901, p. 53 f.), who considers that it is unnecessary and misleading to assume that, whenever a drama treating of one particular episode was composed, it was 'nach dem Rosenkranz des Prophetenspiels gedichtet.' Meyer's theory is that at this period of literary activity in France the poets chose their subjects freely 'wann der Geist sie trieb,' and they did not need to have recourse to the *Sermo* for their inspiration. In the case of *Le Mystère d'Adam* it is difficult to say whether the first half of the work (the two dramatised episodes) or the second half (the procession of prophets) constituted the original nucleus of the play. The two first acts have every appearance of being little independent dramas, complete in themselves, and not mere excrescences of the procession of prophets. It would seem a more likely view to assume that the dramatic part of *Le Mystère d'Adam* was the essential part of the work and that the prophecies were added either to give the required length to the play or to counteract the rather depressing conclusion of the two first acts.

The bibliography at the end of the book should prove useful to students, but we should much like to have seen included the valuable work of Léon Gautier: *Histoire de la poésie liturgique au Moyen-Age*, which contains such an excellent account of the nature, origin and historical development of the 'tropes.' Also a reference might have been expected to the exhaustive work of Wilhelm Meyer already mentioned, which contains much information as to the style, form and versification of the mediaeval drama.

JESSIE CROSLAND.

LONDON.

---

[1] Professor Studer remarks that the *Sermo* was probably written in the sixth century; but it is possible that it ought to be dated at least a century earlier, as the passages from the Old Testament are not taken from the text of the Vulgate but from another translation (cf. W. Meyer, *op. cit.* p. 50).

[2] 'Sah so ein Prophetenspiel nicht aus, wie ein Gesicht, an dem etwa die Nase, ein Ohr oder ein Auge riesig entwickelt, hervorstehen?'

The Ad Deum Vadit of Jean Gerson. By DAVID HOBART CARNAHAN. (*University of Illinois Studies,* Vol. III, No. 1.) Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1917. 4to. xxxix + 116 pp.

The object of this study is, as its author tells us in the Preface, 'to fill a gap in the history of religious eloquence in France.' The sermons of Jean Gerson are little known to any but students of the religious literature of that period, and this ignorance is largely due to the fact that many of them are still only available in manuscript form, or at best in imperfect Latin translations. It is a real advantage therefore to have here in its original form the *Sermon on the Passion*, which is perhaps the most characteristic work of the 'Doctor Christianissimus,' and the most typical of the religious thought of his age.

The Sermon too, for its own sake, deserves to be better known. It was delivered before a distinguished audience and contains some bold and powerful passages, in which the preacher successfully steers a middle course between the cloudy obscurities of the mystics on the one hand, and either the crude realism which often went hand in hand with mysticism, or the coarseness and licence which became only too common in the popular sermons of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, on the other.

Dr Carnahan bases his text on the MS. No. 24841 *fonds français* of the Bibliothèque Nationale, which he has collated with three other manuscripts of the same library. He gives also a brief description of five other Paris MSS. in which the sermon appears in a more or less complete form. But no mention is made of the manuscripts in other libraries. The British Museum, for example, contains at least two (Harl. 4331 and Addit. 9288); the library of Tours two, in one of which we find another variant of the little introductory verse (the usual form: 'A Dieu s'en va par mort amère' appearing as: 'Dieu s'en va a mort amère'), and there are others in divers places. Both the number of manuscripts and the fourteen Latin editions of the *Opera* of Gerson attest the popularity of his writings and sermons during the author's lifetime and for many years after his death, the best known Latin edition being that of Ellies Dupin in 1706. It is the more surprising that the French version of his most famous sermon has remained unpublished until the appearance of the present volume. From the point of view of the language also the Text is an interesting one, but beyond remarking that the language 'belongs to that interesting period of transition which lies between the real Middle Ages and the Renaissance,' Dr Carnahan has not devoted any portion of his *Introduction* to a study of the grammatical forms. He has, however, added a vocabulary of the less common words, which will be useful to those not familiar with the old French terms, a great number of which occur in the sermon. The syntax, as well as the morphology and vocabulary, has much in common with works of an earlier date and would repay study, the more so as a work destined to be delivered orally is likely to represent more faithfully the state of language of a period than a studied literary production would be likely to do. As regards the ideas on the other hand, in spite of the preacher's evident devotion to the Virgin Mary, we find only slight traces of the picturesque metaphors and similes which occur so frequently in the mediaeval writings and preachings. Dr Carnahan mentions one or two allegorical allusions, but does not draw attention to the common mediaeval legend of Leviathan caught by the jaw on the hook of Christ's divinity which lay hidden in the flesh as the body hung on the cross—the passage with its *jeu de mots* has a truly mediaeval ring:—'Or y es tu bien confuz, maleureux ennemi, vielz serpent, Leviathan: tu as cuidé mordre la précieuse char de Ihesus par la morsure de la mort, et l'ameson de la divinité qui estoit dedens, mussee et joincte, a percié tes maxilles, et a delivrré la proie que tu cuidoies tenir et devorer.' But such a passage is the exception rather than the rule.

The 'frequent touches of mysticism' which Dr Carnahan notes in his *Introduction* are of such a mild nature as to emphasize the lack of mysticism in the whole work rather than its presence. One has only to compare Gerson's sermon with those of the famous mystics of the fourteenth century in Germany, or with contemporary writings in England and elsewhere, to see how practical and tangible, and perhaps more suited to a French audience, are the sermons of the French preacher. Mysticism had not at this epoch the same vogue in France as it had in other continental countries, and Gerson, a typical Frenchman of his age, excels in his description of the noisy crowd, the rough soldiery and the altogether human side of things rather than in that of the intangible delights of the mystic's life. It is for the dramatic and powerful scenes, and for the tender pathos attaching to his descriptions of the Virgin's grief for her dead Son, that the sermon deserves to be known, and the more so as it follows a century very barren in that type of religious feeling in France. It is to be hoped therefore that this publication will be followed by others of the same author's works in due course.

JESSIE CROSLAND.

LONDON.

Madame de Staël et la Suisse. Etude biographique et littéraire avec de nombreux documents inédits. Par PIERRE KOHLER. Lausanne and Paris: Payot et Cie. 1916. 8vo. x + 720 pp.

It may be, as an eminent but not very kindly English critic of Madame de Staël once said, that she is conspicuous among French writers in not being honoured by new editions of her works, but the literature dealing with her life and influence has, in recent years, grown apace. This latest contribution to the biography of Madame de Staël by M. Pierre Kohler is of very considerable importance. He provides us liberally with 'documents inédits,' or extracts from such; and although these documents are, separately and individually, rarely of striking interest, yet in the aggregate they help materially to complete the portrait of a woman who, in spite of the fact that she lived the greater part of her life in the limelight of publicity, still remains much of a 'femme incomprise.' Her position in the history of thought and literature at the beginning of the nineteenth century is still a debateable one; and we have to thank M. Kohler for having helped to make it clearer.

He entitles his work *Madame de Staël et la Suisse.* It is not quite clear whether this is a self-imposed limitation, on the part of a writer of Swiss nationality, to a biographical task which threatens—as previous biographers have discovered—to extend into unlimited dimensions: or whether there is behind it a semi-conscious desire to write a chapter in the history of that Swiss 'national literature' on which the younger generation of Swiss critics have been insisting. But it no doubt makes the impression on the reader of a certain apparent lack of proportion. At the same time, there is no chauvinistic spirit—if one may use the word 'chauvinistic' with regard to anything Swiss—in M. Kohler's estimate of the Swiss element in Madame de Staël. Quoting Amiel's characterisation of her he says:

> C'était le sort de Mme de Staël de chérir le pays où elle était née, mais d'en être exilée par les gouvernements, d'y être raillée par la société, de souffrir des défauts du caractère et de l'esprit français : parce qu'elle n'était guère Française que de cœur ; parce qu'elle était étrangère par son origine, son hérédité immédiate, son éducation première, ses traditions domestiques, sa parenté, par beaucoup de ses plus chères affections, par une grande partie de son existence et de son expérience.

M. Kohler sees the Swiss side of Madame de Staël in the didactic and moralising strain in her religious thought, in her individualism, and in her claim for the individual's freedom from the shackles of society and social obligation. She is Swiss, too—although this does not seem at all so apparent—in the fact that she is nothing of an artist. It was France, on the other hand, that moulded her for the world. In this sense she is, as she herself claimed, a citizen of two nations.

Turning to details, M. Kohler has written skilfully and suggestively on Madame de Staël's relations to Rousseau: on the dependence of *Delphine* on the *Nouvelle Héloïse*, as in another chapter he deals equally convincingly with the relations of *Corinne* to Madame de Charrière's *Caliste.* In the chapter on Madame de Staël's relations to Constant—and nowhere is this 'femme incomprise' more enigmatic than just here—M. Kohler is inclined to leave the difficult points to be cleared up by M. Rudler in the sequel to his fine study of Constant. After all, Constant's relations to Madame de Staël are not specifically Swiss. On the other hand, we get characteristic glimpses of Bonstetten and Sismondi (with hitherto unpublished materials). M. Kohler hazards the suggestion that Madame de Staël's sympathetic attitude towards Germany and German literature in *De l'Allemagne* was due to the influence of German Switzerland on her:

> Mais les Suisses allemands...lui ont-ils rendu peut-être un service essentiel en contribuant à l'initier aux mystères de la pensée germanique? Autrement dit, Mme de Staël aurait-elle écrit son ouvrage le plus fécond *De l'Allemagne*, si elle n'avait pas eu, dès sa jeunesse, des rapports avec les Suisses des cantons allemands?

I doubt if much is to be made of this. In any case, the whole question of *De l'Allemagne* is bound up with Madame de Staël's relations to August Wilhelm Schlegel, which might well have been discussed in connection with her life at Coppet: but evidently M. Kohler did not regard this as falling within his purview.

M. Kohler is apologetic for his book having to appear in the midst of the Great War, that the proofs of a work which, so to speak, expresses the spiritual neutrality of Switzerland, should have been corrected in the trenches, whither he had been summoned to maintain the military neutrality of Switzerland. He seeks a justification for publication in the fact that 'l'époque dramatique où l'héroïne de ce volume a joué l'un des premiers rôles offre de singulières analogies avec la crise que nous subissons.' But if an apology is necessary, a subtler one might be sought in the share which Switzerland may have to bear in the spiritual reconstruction of Europe. Here, in a sense which is not touched upon by M. Kohler, Madame de Staël is Swiss: for she is a 'good European,' a representative of the European comity of nations; and where, if not from large-hearted cosmopolitanism like hers, is the healing of the future to come from?

J. G. Robertson.

London.

Studies in Dante. Fourth Series. Textual Criticism of the Convivio and Miscellaneous Essays. By Edward Moore. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1917. 8vo. xii + 303 pp.

The most important sections in this, the fourth, and, we regret to add, the last volume of Edward Moore's Studies in Dante, are undoubtedly those containing his contributions to the textual criticism of the *Convivio.* The scheme of the Oxford Dante did not allow of an *apparatus criticus,* so that Moore was obliged to introduce such emendations as he included without comment or explanation. Moreover, his text was at that time based upon a comparatively restricted knowledge of the manuscripts. He here enters into a detailed discussion of a number of disputed passages and sets forth the principles by which he has been guided in his long and careful study of virtually all the existing manuscripts of the *Convivio.* While fully acknowledging our debt to Giuliani, he has no sympathy with that critic's love of emendation for its own sake. He introduces no alteration if the text as it stands can possibly be explained, and this principle, combined with a careful collation of the manuscript readings, meets with its reward in such a certain restoration of the text as that given on p. 35 from a little-known Paris MS. He leaves a lacuna rather than re-write a hopeless passage.

The other papers, three of which have appeared in the pages of this review, display all the qualities that have won for the earlier volumes of Moore's Studies the high rank they hold in Dante literature—thoroughness of research, leisurely and orderly marshalling of material and argument, modesty in stating his own conclusions. He is as ready to admit the limits of his learning as he is to acknowledge a mistake. The introduction to the *Paradiso* was delivered as a lecture and differs somewhat from the other papers. We feel instinctively that it was hardly a subject with which Moore would have chosen to deal in a small compass. His method was better suited to the exhaustive discussion of a single point than to touching on a few leading aspects of a general question before a mixed audience. The number of the sources from which he draws his material—for the lecture is in places almost a mosaic of quotations—testifies to his vast knowledge of his subject.

The study of 'Santa Lucia in the *Divina Commedia*' is perhaps the most interesting of the three studies here published for the first time. Moore accepts the view that the saint represents the Cooperating Grace of God, but only in the limited sense of its relation to Dante. She is, in fact, Dante's patron saint. Hence the definite acts of personal service involved by her not infrequent intervention in the poem. He also follows Witte in believing that Dante adopted Sta Lucia as his patron because the day of the Syracusan Sta Lucia is celebrated on May 30, the date which there is good reason to believe was Dante's own birthday. Nor is there anything fanciful in holding that the poet was influenced in devoting himself especially to Saint Lucy on account of his defective eyesight.

Moore's conservative attitude towards the manuscripts is carried into other fields of evidence. He is no sceptic. He refuses to doubt Boccaccio's statements about the epitaph on Dante's tomb at Ravenna and he is even inclined to believe that the most doubtful of all Dante's supposed writings, the Battifolle Letters, actually came from the poet's pen. As he points out, it is ridiculous to consider that there is anything derogatory in Dante undertaking to write the Countess's letters to the Empress—their tone is not more humble than Dante's own when writing to his patron Can Grande. But the evidence to be deduced from minute points of style is less convincing. If Moore has not succeeded in bringing them definitely within the canon, he has at least shown that they cannot be summarily rejected.

The different epitaphs written for Dante's tomb are discussed in detail in the paper on that subject, as is also the well-known story of the finding of his bones and the events that may have caused them to be hidden in the Bracciaforte chapel. The excursuses on Becket at Canterbury and Cuthbert at Durham contain interesting English parallels, even to the rumours among the friars of great treasures hidden in the chapel. 'Dante's Theory of Creation,' also a new paper, is a clear and exhaustive treatment of a difficult subject.

Of the notes, that on 'Dante in Northern Latitudes' helps to explain a hard passage in the *Convivio*. Through it, one can see, runs the pious, if unavailing wish to believe that Dante may have visited Oxford, though it is, of course, more than doubtful whether he ever came as far north even as Paris.

L. COLLISON-MORLEY.

LONDON.

The Ladies of Dante's Lyrics. By CHARLES H. GRANDGENT. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917. iv + 181 pp.

Dante. By JEFFERSON BUTLER FLETCHER. London: Williams and Norgate, 1916. 256 pp.

The Mystic Vision in the Grail Legend and in the Divine Comedy. By LIZETTE ANDREWS FISHER. New York: Columbia University Press, 1917. x + 148 pp.

Dante's Lyrical Poems are perhaps the least studied portion of his work, and, until Michele Barbi's long promised critical edition appears, all conclusions in this field must inevitably be more or less tentative. Professor Grandgent has been hampered by the unsatisfactory condition of the texts and by the uncertainty of attributions, but he has written an interesting study round the names of the women who appear in these poems and their relations, or possible relations, with the *Divina Commedia.* He deals with 'Violetta,' whose name was restored to the *Canzoniere* by Casini; 'Matelda'; the mysterious inspirer of the *Rime pietrose*; Beatrice herself; and 'Lisetta,' who is here identified with the compassionate lady of the window in the *Vita Nuova* and transfigured as the allegorical mistress of the *Convivio.* For 'Matelda,' the author goes back to the *Vita Nuova*, and inclines to the view that she may plausibly be recognised in the 'donna giovane e di gentile aspetto molto' associated with Beatrice in the sonnets *Piangete amanti* and *Morte villana* (*V.N.* viii). He regards as a possible hypothesis the identification of the 'Pietra' of the *Rime pietrose* with the lady of the letter to Moroello Malaspina and the canzone *Amor, dacchè convien pur ch' io mi doglia* (Oxford Dante, xi). Against this may perhaps be worth noting the testimony of the manuscripts of the canzoni derived from Boccaccio's exemplar, the rubrics of which manifestly regard the two ladies as different persons, *la sua donna* and *una crudele donna* respectively. Here and there, Professor Grandgent seems to have missed the results of recent investigation. He still attributes to Dante the canzone *Morte, poich' io non truovo a cui mi doglia* (p. 25), which Scherillo long ago proved to be by Jacopo Cecchi, and accepts as authentic the sonnet *Io son sì vago* (p. 33), the authorship of which has been restored to Cino da Pistoia by Barbi. Torraca has argued strongly that the date of the *Amor, dacchè convien* is not 1307 (p. 98), but 1311. Also, the statement that, since Petrarch, the sestina 'has been occasionally but sparingly attempted' (p. 82), needs considerable qualification when we remember the large number of sestine composed by the poets of the Quattrocento and Cinquecento.

A wider field is covered by Professor Fletcher's book, which consists of three essays: 'Dante's Personal Confessions,' 'The Teaching of Dante,' 'The Art of Dante.' They are addressed to the general reader rather than to the specialist. We have noticed a few slips. Dante was not exiled in 1300 (p. 48). He assuredly does not say, of the pilgrims in the *Vita Nuova*, that 'certain persons had come from a far country to Florence, drawn by the fame of the dead Beatrice' (p. 54). St Augustine does not appear in the fourth heaven (p. 112), and the famous Calabrian abbot was not 'Joachim of the Flower' (p. 149). Nor can we for a moment accept the identification of 'Gentucca' with the lady of the *Rime pietrose*. But the book as a whole is worth reading, and the second essay in particular, 'The Teaching of Dante,' contains much that is both interesting and suggestive.

It must frequently have struck students of Dante's theology that the supreme sacrament of the Catholic religion, 'lo pan che il pio padre a nessun serra' (*Par.* xviii. 129), seems to fill an exceptionally insignificant place therein. Dr Fisher's monograph investigates the influence of the doctrine of Transubstantiation upon medieval literature as represented by the legend of the Holy Grail and the *Divina Commedia*. Her treatment of the former is excellent, particularly the correspondence which she shows to exist between the miracles worked by the Grail and those related in mediaeval hagiography in connection with the sacrament of the altar, and her arguments—to the present reviewer at least—are convincing. We are not so satisfied with respect to the *Divina Commedia*. According to the interpretation here suggested, the mystical pageant in the Earthly Paradise resembles, in 'general trend and purpose as well as detail,' the Corpus Christi procession, and Beatrice, whose symbolism varies because 'she stands for religion in the sense of the tie which binds man to God, for union and communion with Him' (p. 107), becomes a symbol of the Eucharist, 'the sacrament in which Christ continues His presence in the Church,' 'the sacrament which is the foretaste of the Beatific Vision.' The argument, for instance, that Beatrice 'is hailed in the very words used daily in the mass to greet the coming of Christ to the altar at the moment of consecration' (p. 116), seems somewhat invalidated by the way Dante elsewhere adapts Eucharistical language and imagery. The phrase of his master Aquinas, *Ecce panis angelorum*, appears in *Par.* ii. 10—12:

> Voi altri pochi, che drizzaste il collo
> Per tempo al pan degli angeli, del quale
> Vivesi qui, ma non sen vien satollo.

To a modern Catholic, the *pan degli angeli* could only mean the sacrament of the altar; but Dante, combining the words of Aquinas with Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 29, transfers it to philosophical knowledge. Thus, again, in *Conv.* i. 1: 'Oh beati que' pochi che seggono a quella mensa ove il pane degli angeli si mangia.'

These three books are welcome indications that the sound tradition of Dante scholarship still continues in the universities of America.

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

LONDON.

Gli Scritti di Francesco de Sanctis e la loro varia fortuna. Saggio bibliografico. By BENEDETTO CROCE. Bari: Laterza, 1917. 8vo. viii + 118 pp.

The name of Francesco de Sanctis probably first became familiar to English readers through the penetrating essay in Villari's *Studies Historical and Critical*, though his *Storia della letteratura italiana* had been the direct source of many brilliant pages of literary criticism in the *Renaissance in Italy* of John Addington Symonds. For many years Benedetto Croce has been engaged in establishing the reputation of the Neapolitan writer and patriot upon a firm basis, in order (as he says) to 'risvegliare e divulgare, con l'esposizione e la polemica, la conoscenza del pensiero del De Sanctis, e renderlo efficace e fecondo nel nuovo pensiero italiano.' The work before us marks the completion of these labours. It is divided into three parts: a full bibliography of the writings of Francesco de Sanctis, an enumeration (with extracts and occasional comments) of biographical and critical writings relating to him, and a prospectus of the forthcoming critical edition to be completed in sixteen volumes. A peculiarly interesting note deals with the vicissitudes of the fame of De Sanctis, and the present relations of his works with Italian literary criticism. An Englishman can hardly, without presumption, express an opinion on the controversy which this essay has occasioned or revived. It may be granted that, in the application of aesthetic and philosophical principles to literary criticism, in treating the history of a nation's literature as 'storia di personalità ideali,' Francesco de Sanctis has had no rival, and that the intense patriotism that inspired his work was never of more vital significance to the student of art and letters than it is to-day. But, without the constant and rigorous application of the *metodo storico*, he who writes literary history 'non fa scienza,' and we cannot help thinking that Benedetto Croce, here and elsewhere, allows himself somewhat to underestimate the defects that are manifest in his hero's masterpiece. Nevertheless, when all has been said, those two volumes of the *Storia della letteratura italiana* remain one of the most illuminating literary histories ever penned, and have deservedly taken their place among Italian classics.

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

LONDON.

MINOR NOTICES.

In the years 1910–12 Professor Erik Björkman published two books —*Nordische Personennamen in England* and *Zur Altenglischen Namenkunde*—of the greatest importance for English name-study. They were reviewed in considerable detail by Dr R. E. Zachrisson, who now reprints his review as *Notes on Early English Personal Names* (*Studier i Modern Språkvetenskap* vi, 9, Uppsala 1917). The review, while it gives high praise to Björkman's work as a whole, deals fully with certain aspects of it in which Zachrisson thinks that it is at fault. In the first place he shows how the author does not distinguish sufficiently clearly between those names which *may* and those which *must* be of Scandinavian origin. The error arises in part from the common fault of failing to consider where a name is found, e.g. the element *Wifel* is common all over England in place-names with the form *Wivel-*, *Wil-*, *Will*(*ing*)-, and cannot be taken as originally or even chiefly of Norse origin. Next Björkman overlooks the fact that a considerable number of names in Domesday Book (his chief source), even in the case of landholders in the days of King Edward, are of continental origin, and often names can be better explained as of continental French (not meaning Norman-French) origin than as derived from Scandinavian sources. Further, some of Björkman's explanations of Domesday forms are invalidated by insufficient attention to those laws of Anglo-French phonology in which the reviewer is an acknowledged expert. Lastly, Zachrisson, out of the fulness of his knowledge, takes Björkman to task for the latter's sweeping statements on the subject of English nicknames, in which he had attacked Wyld in somewhat acrimonious fashion. Zachrisson vindicates Wyld and shows how much more common Old English nicknames are than Björkman will allow. The present writer would suggest that the main difference between Old English and Icelandic usage is that whereas the affixing of a nickname to the Christian name was the usual practice in Iceland, the custom in England was rather to apply the nickname *in place of* the ordinary Christian name, and there is no doubt that the two-word names so common in Iceland and Norway (e.g. Harold Fairhair) are comparatively rare in England.

A. M.

In view of Dr Joseph Hall's recent excellent edition of Minot's Poems, it is not easy to see that there was any need for Mr Douglas C. Stedman's work, *The War Ballads of Laurence Minot. Edited with Introduction, Notes and Glossary* (Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co., 1917); but Mr Stedman's admiration for Minot's 'warrior-ballads' has apparently seemed to him sufficient reason for bringing out his edition.

Mr Stedman's treatment of the grammar and metre of the poems is much briefer than Dr Hall's, but he devotes more space to *The House of Minot*; while Dr Hall's book has, besides appendices, 63 closely printed pages of notes, Mr Stedman's has 11. The notes in the two books generally agree, but Mr Stedman identifies 'þe gude Erle of Glowceter' (v. 53) with James de Audley or Audeley (1316 ?–1369), while Dr Hall takes him for Hugh de Aldithley or Audley who died in 1347. The glossary has been carefully compiled except in regard to etymology, which is given in the case of some words: *dohty* is not directly derived from O.E. *dyhtig* but from *dohtig*; late O.E. *hærnes* is the source of *hernes* and not Icel. *hjarni*; the Gothic relative of *midelerd* is *midjungards* not *midjun-garðs*; *þayre* has not developed from O.E. *þára*, but from O.N. *þeir*(*r*)*a*.

J. D. J.

Mr A. Gabrielson's essay, *The Earliest Swedish Works on English Pronunciation before 1750* (Uppsala, 1917), is an expansion of the second part of Holthausen's paper *Die englische Aussprache bis zum Jahre 1750 nach dänischen und schwedischen Zeugnissen* (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift I, II, Göteborg 1895, 1896), which treats of the Swedish works. Owing to the little commercial and political intercourse between England and Sweden and the consequent absence of need for a knowledge of English among the Swedes, we find that English grammars and dictionaries were not published in Sweden before the eighteenth century. French and German were taught in Swedish universities in the seventeenth century, but teachers of English were first appointed in the universities of Upsala and Lund in 1736 and 1738 respectively. The works dealt with in this essay were mainly based on German books and were greatly inferior to the latter and gave little promise of the sterling work in English Philology which a later generation was to produce in Sweden. Mr Gabrielson's examination is exhaustive both in regard to borrowings and original contributions; these latter amount in fact to very little and throw no new light on any point in the history of English sounds.

The essay, well printed and provided with a full index, has been written with a care and thoroughness worthy of a more profitable subject.

J. D. J.

The new Columbia University Study, *The Early Life of Robert Southey* 1774–1803 by Dr W. Haller (New York, Columbia University Press, 1917), is a valuable and painstaking, if hardly an inspired or inspiring, piece of work. There would however be something wrong with a critic who found inspiration in *Joan of Arc* or *Thalaba*. Dr Haller at least gives us a careful account of Southey's life down to his settlement at Greta Hall, and throws a great deal of light on his motives and impulses, the nature of the change in his political opinions, his literary ambitions and the sources of his works.

He shows himself generally well-informed and accurate, but perhaps lacks to some extent a feeling for the difference in imaginative quality between really good poetry and the second-rate variety. He seems generally to refer to Wordsworth in a tone of disparagement.

In his quotations from Southey we are sorry to see that he introduces American spellings such as 'meter,' 'theater,' 'forever'—it suggests a doubt (probably illfounded) of the accuracy of the reproduction in other respects. Dr Aikin's name is always given as 'Aiken,' Thomson's once (p. 73) as 'Thompson,' Camden's 'Britannia' as 'Brittania.' The word 'registered' is used instead of 'admitted' (or 'matriculated'?) (pp. 65, 185). The forms 'homilectics' (p. 216), 'Dactyllics' (p. 231, etc.), 'deviltry' (p. 255) are odd, and the English reader is at a complete loss to understand 'tooting figures' (p. 268), 'on the outs with Coleridge' (p. 279), 'numbers one through five' (p. 313).

G. C. M. S.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY J. B. PEACE, M.A., AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

PB The Modern language review
1
M65
v.13

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY